

THE FORTNIGHTLY

NOVEMBER, 1939

WORLD ORDER

Whether it is attainable, how it can be attained, and what sort of world a world at peace will have to be

BY H. G. WELLS

THE END OF AN AGE

IN this small book I want to set down as compactly, clearly and usefully as possible the gist of what I have learnt about war and peace in the course of my life. I am not going to write peace propaganda here. I am going to strip down certain general ideas and realities of primary importance to their framework, and so prepare a nucleus of useful knowledge for those who have to go on with this business of making a world peace. I am not going to persuade people to say "Yes, yes" for a world peace, already we have had far too much abolition of war by making declarations and signing resolutions; everybody wants peace or pretends to want peace, and there is no need to add even a sentence more to the vast volume of such ineffective stuff. I am simply attempting to state the things we *must* do and the price we *must* pay for world peace if we really intend to achieve it.

Until the Great War, the First World War, I did not bother very much about war and peace. Since then I have almost specialized upon this problem. It is not very easy to recall former states of mind out of which, day by day and year by year, one has grown, but I think that in the decades before 1914 not only I but most of my generation—in the British Empire, America, France and indeed throughout most of the civilized world—thought that war was dying out.

So it seemed to us. It was an agreeable and therefore a readily acceptable idea. We imagined the Franco-German War of 1870-71 and the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 were the final

conflicts between Great Powers, that now there was a Balance of Power sufficiently stable to make further major warfare impracticable. A Triple Alliance faced a Dual Alliance and neither had much reason for attacking the other. We believed war was shrinking to mere expeditionary affairs on the outskirts of our civilization, a sort of frontier police business. Habits of tolerant intercourse, it seemed, were being strengthened every year that the peace of the Powers remained unbroken.

There was indeed a mild armament race going on ; mild by our present standards of equipment ; the armament industry was a growing and enterprising one ; but we did not see the full implication of that ; we preferred to believe that the increasing general good sense would be strong enough to prevent these multiplying guns from actually going off and hitting anything. And we smiled indulgently at uniforms and parades and army manœuvres. They were the time-honoured toys and regalia of kings and emperors. They were part of the display side of life and would never get to actual destruction and killing. I do not think that exaggerates the easy complacency of, let us say, 1895, forty-five years ago. It was a complacency that lasted with most of us up to 1914. In 1914 hardly anyone in Europe or America below the age of fifty had seen anything of war in his own country.

The world in those days seemed to be drifting steadily towards a tacit but practical unification. One could travel without a passport over the larger part of Europe ; the Postal Union delivered one's letters uncensored and safely from Chile to China ; money, based essentially on gold, fluctuated only very slightly ; and the sprawling British Empire still maintained a tradition of free trade, equal treatment and open-handedness to all comers round and about the planet. In the United States you could go for days and never see a military uniform. Compared with to-day that was, upon the surface at any rate, an age of easy-going safety and good humour. Particularly for the North Americans and the Europeans.

But apart from that steady, ominous growth of the armament industry there were other and deeper forces at work that were preparing trouble. The Foreign Offices of the various sovereign states had not forgotten the competitive traditions of the

eighteenth century. The admirals and generals were contemplating with something between hostility and fascination, the huger weapons the steel industry was gently pressing into their hands. Germany did not share the self-complacency of the English-speaking world; she wanted a place in the sun; there was increasing friction about the partition of the raw material regions of Africa; the British suffered from chronic Russophobia with regard to their vast appropriations in the East, and set themselves to nurse Japan into a modernized imperialist power; and also they "remembered Majuba"; the United States were irritated by the disorder of Cuba and felt that the weak, extended Spanish possessions would be all the better for a change of management. So the game of Power Politics went on, but it went on upon the margins of the prevailing peace. There were several wars and changes of boundaries, but they involved no fundamental disturbance of the general civilized life; they did not seem to threaten its broadening tolerations and understandings in any fundamental fashion. Economic stresses and social trouble stirred and muttered beneath the orderly surfaces of political life but threatened no convulsion. The idea of altogether eliminating war, of clearing what was left of it away, was in the air, but it was free from any sense of urgency. The Hague Tribunal was established and there was a steady dissemination of the conceptions of arbitration and international law. It really seemed to many that the peoples of the earth were settling down in their various territories to a litigious rather than a belligerent order. If there was much social injustice it was being mitigated more and more by a quickening sense of social decency. Acquisitiveness conducted itself with decorum and public-spiritedness was in fashion. Some of it was quite honest public-spiritedness.

In those days, and they are hardly more than half a lifetime behind us, no one thought of any sort of world administration. That patchwork of great Powers and small Powers seemed the most reasonable and practicable method of running the business of mankind. Communications were far too difficult for any sort of centralized world controls. *Around the World in Eighty Days*, when it was published seventy years ago, seemed an extravagant fantasy. It was a world without telephone or

radio, with nothing swifter than a railway train or more destructive than the earlier types of H. E. Shell. They were marvels. It was far more convenient to administer that world of the Balance of Power in separate national areas and, since there were such limited facilities for peoples to get at one another and do each other mischiefs, there seemed no harm in ardent patriotism and the complete independence of separate sovereign states.

Economic life was largely directed by irresponsible private businesses and private finance which, because of their private ownership, were able to spread out their unifying transactions in a network that paid little attention to frontiers and national, racial or religious sentimentality. "Business" was much more of a world commonwealth than the political organizations. There were many people, especially in America, who imagined that "Business" might ultimately unify the world and governments sink into subordination to its network.

Nowadays we can be wise after the event and we can see that below this fair surface of things, disruptive forces were steadily gathering strength. But these disruptive forces played a comparatively small rôle in the world spectacle of half a century ago, when the ideas of that older generation which still dominates our political life and the political education of its successors, were formed. It is from the conflict of those Balance of Power and private enterprise ideas, half a century old, with these ever-growing disruptive forces, that one of the main stresses of our time arises. These ideas worked fairly well in their period and it is still with extreme reluctance that our rulers, teachers, politicians, face the necessity for a profound mental adaptation of their views, methods and interpretations to these disruptive forces that once seemed so negligible and which are now shattering their old order completely.

It was because of this belief in a growing goodwill among nations, because of the general satisfaction with things as they were, that the German declarations of war in 1914 aroused such a storm of indignation throughout the entire comfortable world. It was felt that the German Kaiser had broken the tranquillity of the world club, wantonly and needlessly. The war was fought "against the Hohenzollerns". They were to be expelled from the club, certain punitive fines were to be paid and

all would be well. That was the British idea of 1914. This out-of-date war business was then to be cleared up once for all by a mutual guarantee by all the more respectable members of the club through a League of Nations. There was no apprehension of any deeper operating causes in that great convulsion on the part of the worthy elder statesmen who made the peace. And so Versailles and its codicils.

For twenty years the disruptive forces have gone on growing beneath the surface of that genteel and shallow settlement, and for twenty years there has been no resolute attack upon the riddles with which their growth confronts us. For all that period the League of Nations has been the opiate of liberal thought in the world.

To-day there is war to get rid of Adolf Hitler who, has taken the part of the Hohenzollerns in the drama. He too has outraged the Club Rules and he too is to be expelled. The war, the Chamberlain—Hitler War, is being waged so far by the British Empire in quite the old spirit. It has learnt nothing and forgotten nothing. There is the same resolute disregard of any more fundamental problem.

Still the minds of our comfortable and influential ruling-class people refuse to accept the plain intimation that their time is over, that the Balance of Power and uncontrolled business methods cannot continue, and that Hitler, like the Hohenzollerns, is a mere offensive pustule on the face of a deeply ailing world. To get rid of him and his Nazis will be no more a cure for the world's ills than scraping will heal measles. The disease will manifest itself in some new eruption. It is the system of nationalist individualism and unco-ordinated enterprise that is the world's disease and it is the whole system that has to go. It has to be reconditioned down to its foundations or replaced. It cannot hope to "muddle through" amiably, wastefully and dangerously, a second time.

World peace means all that much revolution. More and more of us begin to realize that it cannot mean less.

The first thing therefore that has to be done in thinking out the primary problems of a world peace is to realize this, that we are living in the end of a definite period of history, the period of the sovereign states. As we used to say in the eighties with

ever-increasing truth : " We are in an age of transition." Now we get some measure of the acuteness of the transition. It is a phase of human life which may lead, as I am trying to show, either to a *new way of living* for our species or else to a longer or briefer *dégringolade* of violence, misery, destruction, death and the extinction of mankind. These are not rhetorical phrases I am using here ; I mean exactly what I say, the disastrous extinction of mankind.

That is the issue before us. It is no small affair of parlour politics we have to consider. As I write, in this moment, thousands of people are being killed, wounded, hunted, tormented, ill-treated, delivered up to the most intolerable and hopeless anxiety and destroyed morally and mentally, and there is nothing in sight at present to arrest this spreading process and prevent its reaching you and yours. It is coming for you and yours now at a great pace. Plainly in so far as we are rational foreseeing creatures there is nothing for any of us now but to make this world peace problem the ruling interest and direction of our lives. If we run away from it it will pursue and get us. We have to face it. We have to solve it or be destroyed by it. It is as urgent and comprehensive as that.

OPEN CONFERENCE

Before we examine what I have called so far the " disruptive forces " in the current social order, let me underline one primary necessity for the most outspoken free discussion of the battling organizations and the crumbling institutions amidst which we lead our present uncomfortable and precarious lives. There must be no protection for leaders and organizations from the most searching criticism, on the plea that our country is or may be at war. Or on any pretence. We must talk openly, widely and plainly. The war is incidental ; the need for revolutionary reconstruction is fundamental. None of us is clear as yet upon some of the most vital questions before us, we are not lucid enough in our own minds to be ambiguous, and a mumbling tactfulness and indirect half-statements made with an eye upon some censor, will confuse our thoughts and the thoughts of those with whom we desire understanding, to the complete sterilization and defeat of every reconstructive effort.

We want to talk and tell exactly what our ideas and feelings are, not only to our fellow citizens, but to our allies, to neutrals and above all to the people who are marshalled in arms against us. We want to get the same sincerity from them. Because until we have worked out a common basis of ideas with them, peace will be only an uncertain equilibrium while fresh antagonisms develop.

Concurrently with this war we need a great debate. We want every possible person in the world to take part in that debate. It is something much more important than the actual warfare. It is intolerable to think of this storm of universal distress leading up to nothing but some "conference" of diplomatists out of touch with the world, with secret sessions, ambiguous "understandings" . . . Not twice surely can that occur? And yet what is going to prevent its recurring?

It is quite easy to define the reasonable limits of censorship in a belligerent country. It is manifest that the publication of any information likely to be of the slightest use to an enemy must be drastically anticipated and suppressed; not only direct information, for example, but intimations and careless betrayals about the position and movements of ships, troops, camps, depôts of munitions, food supplies, and false reports of defeats and victories and coming shortages, anything that may lead to blind panic and hysteria, and so forth and so on. But the matter takes on a different aspect altogether when it comes to statements and suggestions that may affect public opinion in one's own country or abroad and which may help us towards wholesome and corrective political action.

One of the more unpleasant aspects of a state of war under modern conditions is the appearance of a swarm of individuals too clever by half, in positions of authority, excited, conceited, prepared to lie, distort and generally humbug people into states of acquiescence, resistance, indignation, vindictiveness, doubt and mental confusion, states of mind supposed to be conducive to a final military victory. These people love to twist and censor facts. It gives them a feeling of power; if they cannot create they can at least prevent and conceal. Particularly they poke themselves in between us and the people with whom we are at war to distort any possible reconciliation. They sit,

filled with the wine of their transitory powers, aloof from the fatigues and dangers of conflict, pulling imaginary strings in people's minds.

In Germany popular thought is supposed to be under the control of Herr Dr. Goebbels ; in Great Britain we writers have been invited to place ourselves at the disposal of Lord Perth, a particularly brilliant choice, since he was secretary of the now moribund League of Nations from its days of hope to its day of decrepitude, and there is (or was) a curious organization, the creation I am told of Lord Lloyd, the British Council, which sends emissaries abroad, writers and other cultural personages, to lecture, charm and win over foreign appreciation for British characteristics, for British scenery, British political virtues and so forth. Somehow this is supposed to help something or other. Quietly, unobtrusively, this has gone on.

Maybe these sample British give unauthorized assurances but probably they do little positive harm. But they ought not to be employed at all. It is government treason against the people. I have described the activities and ideas of one of these missionaries of the British idea, Mr. Teeling, the author of *Crisis for Christianity*, in my *Fate of Homo sapiens*. He is a personal friend of the present Pope and apparently there is a suggestion abroad that the English will favour a revival of the Holy Roman Empire. Could anything be more stupid and ridiculous, more alien to normal English thought ? But it is not so much the actual mischief of the British Council I would criticize as the conceited aggressiveness of the disposition it betrays. It is going to blinker and steer intelligences ; it is going to allure and guide.

It is not only that these various Ministries of Information and Propaganda do their level best to divert the limited gifts and energies of such writers, lecturers and talkers as we possess, to the production of disingenuous muck that will muddle the public mind and mislead the enquiring foreigner, but that they show a marked disposition to stifle any free and independent utterances that may seem to traverse their own profound and secret plans for the salvation of mankind.

Everywhere now it is extremely difficult to get adequate, far-reaching publicity for outspoken discussion of the way the

world is going, and the political, economic and social forces that carry us along. This is not so much due to deliberate suppression as to the general disorder into which human affairs are dissolving. There is indeed in the Atlantic world hardly a sign as yet of that direct espionage upon opinion that obliterates the mental life of the intelligent Italian or German or Russian to-day almost completely; one may still think what one likes, say what one likes and write what one likes, but nevertheless there is already an increasing difficulty in getting bold unorthodox views heard and read. Newspapers are afraid upon all sorts of minor counts, publishers, with such valiant exceptions as the publishers of this matter, are morbidly discreet; there are obscure boycotts and trade difficulties hindering the wide diffusion of general ideas in countless ways. I do not mean there is any sort of organized conspiracy to suppress discussion, but I do say that the press, the publishing and the bookselling organizations in our free countries, are failing in their duty to provide a fair and stimulating distribution of discussion.

Publishers publish for nothing but safe profits; it would astound a bookseller to tell him he was part of the world's educational organization or a publisher's traveller that he existed for any other purpose than to book maximum orders for best sellers and earn a record commission—letting the other stuff, the highbrow stuff and all that, go hang. They do not understand that they ought to put public services before gain. They have no inducement to do so and no pride in their function. Theirs is the morale of a profiteering world. Newspapers like to insert brave-looking articles of conventional liberalism, speaking highly of peace and displaying a noble vagueness about its attainment; now we are at war they will publish the fiercest attacks upon the enemy—because such attacks are supposed to keep up the fighting spirit of the country; but any ideas that are really loudly and clearly revolutionary they dare not circulate at all. Under these baffling conditions there is no thorough discussion of the world outlook whatever, anywhere. The democracies are only a shade better than the dictatorships in this respect. It is ridiculous to represent them as realms of light at issue with darkness.

This great debate upon the reconstruction of the world is a thing more important and urgent than the war, and there exist

no adequate media for the utterance and criticism and correction of any broad general convictions. There is a certain fruitless and unproductive spluttering of constructive ideas, but there is little sense of sustained enquiry, few real interchanges, inadequate progress, nothing is settled, nothing is dismissed as unsound and nothing is won permanently. No one seems to hear what anyone else is saying. That is because there is no sense of an audience for these ideologists. There is no effective audience saying rudely and obstinately : " What A. has said, seems important. Will B. and C., instead of bombinating in the void, tell us exactly where and why they differ from A ? And now we have got to the common truth of A., B., C., and D. Here is F. saying something. Will he be so good as to correlate what he has to say with A., B., C. and D ? "

But there is no such background of an intelligently observant and critical world audience in evidence. There is no one, no reviewer, no letter-writer, who ever points out to B. politely and clearly that he has already been anticipated and disposed of by A. There are a few people here and there reading and thinking in disconnected fragments. This is all the thinking our world is doing in the face of planetary disaster. The universities, bless them ! are in uniform or silent.

We are plainly drifting towards world catastrophe. None of us knows clearly and surely what is to be done ; yet hardly any of us are talking enquiringly, plainly, unrestrainedly, frankly and modestly about the broad processes involved. The business is impossible unless we do that. Our species in going on blindly to irretrievable disaster, mumbling and gibbering, utterly muddle-headed.

We need to air our own minds ; we need frank exchanges, if we are to achieve any general guiding understanding. We need to work out a clear conception of the world order we would prefer to this present chaos, we need to dissolve or compromise upon our differences so that we may set our faces with assurance towards an attainable world peace. The air is full of the panaceas of half-wits, none listening to the others and most of them trying to silence the others in their impatience. Thousands of fools are ready to write us a complete prescription for our world troubles. Will people never realize their own ignorance

and incompletenesses, from which arise this absolute necessity for the plainest statement of the realities of the problem, for the most exhaustive and unsparing examination of differences of opinion, and for the most ruthless canvassing of every possibility, however unpalatable it may seem at first, of the situation?

Before anything else, therefore, in this survey of the way to world peace I put free speech and vigorous publication. It is the thing best worth fighting for. It is the essence of your personal honour. It is your first duty as a world citizen to do what you can for that. You have not only to resist suppressions, you have to fight your way out of a fog. If you find your bookseller or newsagent failing to distribute any type of publication whatever—even if you are in entire disagreement with the views of that publication—you should turn the weapon of the boycott upon the offender and find another bookseller or newsagent for everything you read. It is an outrageous insult to the mental freedom of our people, who before almost everything else at the present time need to know what is being thought and said in America, that our British distributors are boycotting various American publications, partly perhaps out of muddle-headed loyalty, which resents even the friendly truth about eminent persons, but mainly I fear in order to favour inferior British productions. I am told that the boycott is not official and that these outspoken American publications can be got by post from America upon a yearly subscription. But for three weeks now as I write this my copy of the *New York Time* has been held up on its way to me.

The would-be world citizen should subscribe also to such an organization as the National Council for Civil Liberties; he should use any advantage his position may give him to check suppression of free speech; and he should accustom himself to challenge nonsense politely but firmly and say fearlessly and as clearly as possible what is in his mind and to listen as fearlessly to whatever is said to him. So that he may know better either through reassurance or correction. To get together with other people to argue and discuss, to think and organize and then implement thought is the first duty of every reasonable man.

This world of ours is going to pieces. It has to be reconstructed and it can only be effectively reconstructed in the light. Only

the free, clear, open mind can save us, and these difficulties and obstructions on our line of thought are as evil as children putting obstacles on a railway line or scattering nails on an automobile speed track.

DISRUPTIVE FORCES

And now let us come to the disruptive forces that have reduced the late-nineteenth-century dream of a powerful world patchwork of more and more civilized states linked by an ever-increasing financial and economic interdependence, to complete incredibility, and so forced upon every intelligent mind the need to work out a new conception of the world that ought to be. *It is supremely important that the nature of these disruptive forces should be clearly understood and kept in mind. To grasp them is to hold the clue to the world's present troubles. To forget about them, even for a moment, is to lose touch with essential reality and drift away into minor issues.*

The first group of these forces is what people are accustomed to speak of as "the abolition of distance" and "the change of scale" in human operations. This "abolition of distance", began rather more than a century ago, and its earlier effects were not disruptive at all. It knit together the spreading United States of America over distances that might otherwise have strained their solidarity to the breaking-point, and it enabled the sprawling British Empire to sustain contacts round the whole planet.

The disruptive influence of the abolition of distance appeared only later. Let us be clear upon its essential significance. For what seemed like endless centuries the swiftest means of locomotion had been the horse on the high-road, the running man, the galley and the uncertain, weather-ruled sailing ship. (There was the Dutchman on skates on his canals, but that was an exceptional culmination of speed and not for general application). The political, social and imaginative life of man for all those centuries was adapted to these limiting conditions. They determined the distances to which marketable goods could conveniently be sent, the limits to which the ruler could send his orders and his soldiers, the bounds set to getting news, and indeed the whole scale of living. There could be very little

real community feeling beyond the range of frequent intercourse.

Human life fell naturally therefore into areas determined by the interplay between these limitations and such natural obstacles as seas and mountains. Such countries as France, England, Egypt, Japan, appeared and reappeared in history like natural, necessary things, and though there were such larger political efforts as the Roman Empire, they never attained an enduring unity. The Roman Empire held together like wet blotting-paper; it was always falling to pieces. The older Empires, beyond their national nuclei, were mere precarious tribute-levying powers. What I have already called the world patchwork of the great and little Powers, was therefore, under the old horse-and-foot and sailing-ship conditions, almost as much a matter of natural necessity as the sizes of trees and animals.

Within a century all this has been changed and we have still to face up to what that change means for us.

First came steam, the steam-railway, the steamship, and then in a quickening crescendo came the internal combustion engine, electrical traction, the motor car, the motor boat, the aeroplane, the transmission of power from central power stations, the telephone, the radio. I feel apologetic in reciting this well known story. I do so in order to enforce the statement that all the areas that were the most convenient and efficient for the old, time-honoured way of living, became more and more inconveniently close and narrow for the new needs. This applied to every sort of administrative area, from municipalities and urban districts and the range of distributing businesses, up to sovereign states. They were—and for the most part they still are—too small for the new requirements and far too close together. All over the social lay-out this tightening-up and squeezing together is an inconvenience, but when it comes to the areas of sovereign states it becomes impossibly dangerous. It becomes an intolerable thing; human life cannot go on, with the capitals of most of the civilized countries of the world within an hour's bombing range of their frontiers, behind which attacks can be prepared and secret preparations made without any form of control. And yet we are still tolerant and loyal to arrangements that seek to maintain this state of affairs and treat it as though nothing else were possible.

The present war for and against Hitler and Stalin and Mr. Chamberlain and so forth does not even touch upon the essential problem of the abolition of distance. It may indeed destroy everything and still settle nothing. If one could wipe out all the issues of the present conflict, we should still be confronted with the essential riddle, which is the abolition of the boundaries of most existing sovereign states and their merger in some larger Pax. We have to do that if any supportable human life is to go on. Treaties and mutual guarantees are not enough. We have surely learnt enough about the value of treaties during the last half century to realize that. We have, because of the abolition of distance alone, to gather human affairs together under one common war-preventing control.

But this abolition of distance is only one most vivid aspect of the change in the conditions of human life. Interwoven with that is a general change of scale in human operations. The past hundred years has been an age of invention and discovery beyond the achievements of the preceding three millennia. In a book I published eight years ago, *The Work Wealth and Happiness of Mankind*, I tried to summarize the conquest of power and substances that is still going on. There is more power expended in a modern city like Birmingham in a day than we needed to keep the whole of Elizabethan England going for a year; there is more destructive energy in a single tank than sufficed the army of William I. for the conquest of England. Man is able now to produce or destroy on a scale beyond comparison greater than he could before this storm of invention began. And the consequence is the continual further dislocation of the orderly social life of our great-great-grandfathers. No trade, no profession, is exempt. The old social routines and classifications have been as people say "knocked silly". There is no sort of occupation, fisheries, farming, textile work, metal work, mining, which is not suffering from constant readjustment to new methods and facilities. Our traditions of trade and distribution flounder after these changes. Skilled occupations disappear in the general social liquefaction.

The new power organizations are destroying the forests of the world at headlong speed, ploughing great grazing areas into deserts, exhausting mineral resources, killing off whales,

seals and a multitude of rare and beautiful species, destroying the morale of every social type and devastating the planet. The institutions of the private appropriation of land and natural resources generally, and of private enterprise for profit, which did produce a fairly tolerable, stable and "civilized" social life for all but the most impoverished, in Europe, America and the East, for some centuries, have been expanded to a monstrous destructiveness by the new opportunities. The patient, nibbling, enterprising profit-seeker of the past, magnified and equipped now with the huge claws and teeth the change of scale has provided for him, has torn the old economic order to rags. Quite apart from war, our planet is being wasted and disorganized. Yet the process goes on, without any general control more monstrously destructive even than the continually enhanced terrors of modern warfare.

Now it has to be made clear that these two things, the manifest necessity for some collective world control to eliminate warfare and the less generally admitted necessity for a collective control of the economic and biological life of mankind, are *aspects of one and the same process*. Of the two the disorganization of the ordinary life which is going on, war or no war, is the graver and least reversible. Both arise out of the abolition of distance and the change of scale, they affect and modify each other, and unless their parallelism and interdependence is recognized, any projects for world federation or anything of the sort are doomed inevitably to frustration.

That is where the League of Nations broke down completely. It was legal; it was political. It was devised by an ex-professor of the old-fashioned history assisted by a few politicians. It ignored the vast disorganization of human life by technical revolutions, big business and modern finance that was going on of which the Great War itself was scarcely more than a by-product. It was constituted as though nothing of that sort was occurring.

This war storm which is breaking upon us now, due to the continued fragmentation of human government among a patchwork of sovereign states, is only one aspect of the general need for a rational consolidation of human affairs. The independent sovereign state with its perpetual war threat, armed with the

resources of modern mechanical frightfulness, is only the most blatant and terrifying aspect of that same want of a coherent general control that makes overgrown, independent, sovereign, private business organizations and combinations, socially destructive. We should still be at the mercy of the "Napoleons" of commerce and the "Attilas" of finance, if there was not a gun or a battleship or a tank or a military uniform in the world. We should still be sold up and dispossessed.

Political federation, we have to realize, without a concurrent economic collectivization, is bound to fail. The task of the peace-maker who really desires peace in a new world, involves not merely a political but a profound social revolution, profounder even than the revolution attempted by the Communists in Russia. The Russian Revolution failed not by its extremism but through the impatience, violence and intolerance of its onset, through lack of foresight and intellectual insufficiency. The cosmopolitan revolution to a world collectivism, which is the only alternative to chaos and degeneration before mankind, has to go much further than the Russian; it has to be more thorough and better conceived and its achievement demands a much more heroic and more steadfast thrust.

It serves no useful purpose to shut our eyes to the magnitude and intricacy of the task of making the world peace. These are the basic factors of the case.

CLASS-WAR

Now here it is necessary to make a distinction which is far too frequently ignored. Collectivization means the handling of the common affairs of mankind by a common control responsible to the whole community. It means the suppression of go-as-you-please in social and economic affairs just as much as in international affairs. It means the frank abolition of profit-seeking and of every device by which human beings contrive to be parasitic on their fellow men. It is the practical realization of the brotherhood of man through a common control. It means all that and it means no more than that.

The necessary nature of that control, the way to attain it and to maintain it have still to be discussed.

The early forms of socialism were attempts to think out and try out collectivist systems. But with the advent of Marxism, the larger idea of collectivism became entangled with a smaller one, the perpetual conflict of people in any unregulated social system to get the better of one another. Throughout the ages this has been going on. The rich, the powerful generally, the more intelligent and acquisitive have got away with things, and sweated, oppressed, enslaved, bought and frustrated the less intelligent, the less acquisitive and the unwary. The Haves in every generation have always got the better of the Have-nots, and the Have-nots have always resented the privations of their disadvantage.

So it is and so in the uncollectivized world it has always been. The bitter cry of the expropriated man echoes down the ages from ancient Egypt and the Hebrew prophets, denouncing those who grind the faces of the poor. At times the Have-nots have been so uneducated, so helplessly distributed among their more successful fellows that they have been incapable of social disturbance, but whenever such developments as plantation or factory labour, the accumulation of men in seaport towns, the disbanding of armies, famine and so forth, brought together masses of men at the same disadvantage, their individual resentments flowed together and became a common resentment. The miseries underlying human society were revealed. The Haves found themselves assailed by resentful, vindictive revolt.

Let us note that these revolts of the Have-nots throughout the ages have sometimes been very destructive, but that invariably they have failed to make any fundamental change in this old, old story of getting and not getting the upper hand. Sometimes the Have-nots have frightened or otherwise moved the Haves to more decent behaviour. Often the Have-nots have found a champion who has ridden to power on their wrongs. Then the ricks were burnt or the châteaux. The aristocrats were guillotined and their heads carried on exemplary pikes. Such storms passed and when they passed, there for all practical purposes was the old order returning again; new people but the old inequalities. Returning inevitably, with only slight variations in appearance and phraseology, under the condition of a non-collective social order.

The point to note is that in the unplanned scramble of human life through the centuries of the horse-and-foot period, these incessantly recurring outbreaks of the losers against the winners have never once produced any permanent amelioration of the common lot, or greatly changed the features of the human community. Not once.

The Have-nots have never produced the intelligence and the ability and the Haves have never produced the conscience, to make a permanent alteration of the rules of the game. Slave revolts, peasant revolts, revolts of the proletariat have always been fits of rage, acute social fevers which have passed. The fact remains that history produces no reason for supposing that the Have-nots, considered as a whole, have available any reserves of directive and administrative capacity and disinterested devotion, superior to that of the more successful classes. Morally, intellectually, there is no reason to suppose them better.

Many potentially able people may miss education and opportunity; they may not be inherently inferior but nevertheless they are crippled and incapacitated and kept down. They are spoilt. Many specially gifted people may fail to "make good" in a jostling, competitive, acquisitive world and so fall into poverty and into the baffled, limited ways of living of the commonalty, but they too are exceptions. The idea of a right-minded Proletariat ready to take things over is a dream.

As the collectivist idea has developed out of the original propositions of socialism, the more lucid thinkers have put this age-long bitterness of the Haves and Have-nots into its proper place as part, as the most distressing part, but still only as part, of the vast wastage of human resources that their disorderly exploitation entailed. In the light of current events they have come to realize more and more clearly that the need and possibility of arresting this waste by a world-wide collectivization is becoming continually more possible and at the same time imperative. They have had no delusions about the education and liberation that is necessary to gain that end. They have been moved less by moral impulses and sentimental pity and so forth, admirable but futile motives, as by the intense intellectual irritation of

living in a foolish and destructive system. They are revolutionaries not because the present way of living is a hard and tyrannous way of living but because it is from top to bottom exasperatingly stupid.

But thrusting athwart the socialist movement towards collectivization and its research for some competent directive organization of the world's affairs, came the clumsy initiative of Marxism with its class-war dogma, which has done more to misdirect and sterilize human good-will than any other misconception of reality that has ever stultified human effort.

Marx saw the world from a study and through the hazes of a vast ambition. He swam in the current ideologies of his time and so he shared the prevalent socialist drive towards collectivization. But while his sounder-minded contemporaries were studying means and ends he jumped from a very imperfect understanding of the Trades Union movement in Britain to the wildest generalizations about the social process. He invented and antagonized two phantoms. One was the Capitalist System ; the other the Worker.

There never has been anything on earth that could be properly called a Capitalist *System*. What was the matter with his world was manifestly its entire want of system. What the socialists were feeling their way towards was the discovery and establishment of a world system.

The Haves of our period were and are a fantastic miscellany of people, inheriting or getting their power and influence by the most various means and methods. They had and have nothing of the interbreeding social solidarity even of a feudal aristocracy or an Indian caste. But Marx, looking rather into his inner consciousness than at any concrete reality, evolved that monster "System" on his right. Then over against it, still gazing steadily into that vacuum, he discovered on the Left the proletarians being steadily expropriated and becoming class-conscious. They were just as endlessly various in reality as the people at the top of the scramble ; in reality but not in the mind of the Communist seer. There they consolidated rapidly.

So while other men toiled at this gigantic problem of collectivization, Marx found his almost childish simple recipe. All you had to do was to tell the workers that they were being

robbed and enslaved by this wicked Capitalist System devised by the "bourgeoisie". They need only "unite"; they had "nothing to lose but their chains". The wicked Capitalist System was to be overthrown, with a certain vindictive liquidation of "capitalists" in general and the "bourgeoisie" in particular, and a millennium would ensue under a purely workers' control, which Lenin later on was to crystallize into that phrase of supra-theological mystery, "the dictatorship of the proletariat". The workers need learn nothing, plan nothing; they were right and good by nature; they would just "take over". The infinitely various envies, hatreds and resentments of the Have-nots were to fuse into a mighty creative drive. All virtue resided in them; all evil in those who had bettered them. One good thing there was in this new doctrine of the class war, it inculcated a much needed brotherliness among the workers, but it was balanced by the organization of class hate. So the great propaganda of the class war, with these monstrous falsifications of manifest fact, went forth. Collectivization would not so much be organized as appear magically when the incubus of Capitalism and all those irritatingly well-to-do people, were lifted off the great Proletarian soul.

Marx was a man incapable in money affairs and much bothered by tradesmen's bills. Moreover he cherished absurd pretensions to aristocracy. The consequence was that he romanced about the lovely life of the Middle Ages like another Belloc, and concentrated his animus upon the "bourgeoisie", whom he made responsible for all those great disruptive forces in human society that we have considered. Lord Bacon, the Marquis of Worcester, Charles the Second and the Royal Society, people like Cavendish and Joule and Watt for example, all became "bourgeoisie" in his inflamed imagination. "During its reign of scarce a century" he wrote in the *Communist Manifesto*, "the bourgeoisie has created more powerful, more stupendous forces of production than all preceding generations rolled into one. . . . What earlier generations had the remotest inkling that such productive forces slumbered within the wombs of associated labour?"

"The wombs of associated labour!" (Gollys, what a phrase!) The industrial revolution which was a consequence of the

mechanical revolution is treated as the cause of it. Could facts be muddled more completely ?

And again : “. . . the bourgeois system is no longer able to cope with the abundance of the wealth it creates. How does the bourgeoisie overcome these crises ? On the one hand, by the compulsory annihilation of a quantity of the productive forces ; on the other, by the conquest of new markets and the more thorough exploitation of old ones. With what results ? The results are that the way is paved for more widespread and more disastrous crises and that the capacity for averting such crises is lessened.

“ The weapons ” (Weapons ! How that sedentary gentleman in his vast beard adored military images !) “ with which the bourgeoisie overthrew feudalism are now being turned against the bourgeoisie itself.

“ But the bourgeoisie has not only forged the weapons that will slay it ; it has also engendered the men who will use these weapons—the modern workers, the proletarians.”

And so here they are, hammer and sickle in hand, chest stuck out, proud, magnificent, commanding, in the *Manifesto*. But go and look for them yourself in the streets. Go and look at them in Russia.

Even for 1848 this is not intelligent social analysis. It is the outpouring of a man with a B in his bonnet, the hated Bourgeoisie, a man with a certain vision, uncritical of his own sub-conscious prejudices, but shrewd enough to realize how great a driving force is hate and the inferiority complex.

Stripped down to its core in this fashion, the primary falsity of the Marxist assumption is evident. But it is one of the queer common weaknesses of the human mind to be uncritical of primary assumptions and to smother up any enquiry into their soundness in secondary elaboration, in technicalities and conventional formulæ. Most of our systems of belief rest upon rotten foundations, and generally these foundations are made sacred to preserve them from attack. They become dogmas in a sort of holy of holies. It is shockingly uncivil to say “ But that is nonsense ”. The defenders of all the dogmatic religions fly into rage and indignation when one touches on the absurdity

of their foundations. Especially if one laughs. That is blasphemy.

This avoidance of fundamental criticism is one of the greatest dangers to any general human understanding. Marxism is no exception to the universal tendency. The Capitalist System has to be a real system, the Bourgeoisie are organized conspiracy against the Workers, and every human conflict everywhere has to be an aspect of the Class War, or they cannot talk to you. They will not listen to you. Never once has there been an attempt to answer the plain things I have said about them. Anything not in their language flows off their minds like water off a duck's back. Even Lenin—by far the subtlest mind in the Communist story—had not escaped this pitfall, and when I talked to him in Moscow in 1920 he seemed quite unable to realize that the violent conflict going on in Ireland between the Catholic nationalists and the Protestant garrison was not his sacred insurrection of the Proletariat in full blast.

To-day there is quite a number of writers, and among them there are men of science who ought to think better, solemnly elaborating a pseudo-philosophy of science and society upon the deeply buried but entirely nonsensical foundations laid by Marx. Month by month the industrious Left Book Club pours a new volume over the minds of its devotees to sustain their mental habits and pickle them against the septic influence of unorthodox literature. A Party Index of Forbidden Books will no doubt follow. Distinguished professors with a solemn delight in their own remarkable ingenuity, lecture and discourse and even produce serious-looking volumes, upon the superiority of Marxist physics and Marxist research, to the unbranded activities of the human mind. One tries not to be rude to them, but it is hard to believe they are not deliberately playing the fool with their brains.

Or have they a feeling that revolutionary communism is ahead of us, and are they doing their best to rationalize it with an eye to those red days to come?

Here I cannot pursue in any detail the story of the Rise and Corruption of Marxism in Russia. It confirms in every particular my contention that the class war idea is an entanglement and perversion of the world drive towards a world collectivism, a

wasting disease of cosmopolitan socialism. It has followed in its general outline the common history of every revolt of the Have-nots since history began. Russia in the shadows displayed an immense inefficiency and sank slowly to Russia in the dark. Its galaxy of incompetent foremen, managers, organizers and so forth, developed the most complicated system of self-protection against criticism, they sabotaged one another, they intrigued against one another. You can read the quintessence of the thing in Littlepage's *In Search of Soviet Gold*. And like every other Have-not revolt since the dawn of history, hero worship took possession of the insurgent masses. The inevitable Champion appeared. They escape from the Czar and in twenty years they are worshipping Stalin, originally a fairly honest, unoriginal, ambitious revolutionary, driven to self-defensive cruelty and inflated by flattery to his present quasi-divine autocracy. The cycle completes itself and we see that like every other merely insurrectionary revolution, nothing has changed; a lot of people have been liquidated and a lot of other people have replaced them and Russia seems returning back to the point at which it started, to a patriotic absolutism of doubtful efficiency and vague, incalculable aims. Stalin, I believe, is honest and benevolent in intention, he believes in collectivism simply and plainly, he is still under the impression that he is making a good thing of Russia and of the countries within her sphere of influence, and he is self-righteously impatient of criticism or opposition. His successor may not have the same disinterestedness.

But I have written enough to make it clear why we have to dissociate collectivization altogether from the class war in our minds. Let us waste no more time on the spectacle of the Marxist putting the cart in front of the horse and tying himself up with the harness. We have to put all this proletarian distortion of the case out of our minds and start afresh upon the problem of how to realize the *new and unprecedented possibilities of world collectivization* that have opened out upon the world in the past hundred years. That is a new story. An entirely different story.

We are human beings facing gigantic forces that will either destroy our species altogether or lift it to an altogether un-

precedented level of power and well-being. These forces have to be controlled or we shall be annihilated. But competently controlled they can abolish toil, they can abolish poverty, they can abolish slavery—by the one sure means of making these things unnecessary. Class-war communism has had its opportunity to realize all this, and it has failed to make good. So far it has only replaced one autocratic Russia by another. Russia, like all the rest of the world, is still facing the problem of the competent government of a collective system. She has not solved it.

The dictatorship of the proletariat has failed us. We have to look for possibilities of control in other directions. Are they to be found?

(To be continued.)

STRATEGY BY LAND, SEA AND AIR

I.—THE LAND

BY MAJOR-GENERAL SIR CHARLES GWYNN

GERMANY'S lightning victory over Poland has given her little cause for self-congratulation. It may be that the gallant resistance to aggression offered by the Poles will have even more far reaching influences on the final issue than had even the Russian invasion of East Prussia in 1914, which ended so disastrously at Tannenberg. Then, the dispatch of Divisions from the Western front in response to a call from East Prussian Junkers for protection was one of Von Moltke's grosser errors which made the miracle of the Marne possible.

What price has Germany paid for her victory this time? Her direct losses in men and material have been considerable but, of course, not crippling—though they are probably higher than Hitler has announced. Much more important is the fact that, while the Polish campaign was in progress, France was allowed to complete her mobilization without interference and that the British Field Army, with its multitude of vehicles and its elaborate base Depôt organization, has been landed in France without the loss of men or equipment. These are astonishing and totally unexpected events of a purely military character and we are left wondering to what the immunity of the Allied forces and their communications was due. Was it simply that so large a proportion of Germany's forces was needed to secure lightning results in Poland that it was thought that a weak effort in the West would be overwhelmed by the superior forces of the Allies and that it was better, therefore, to wait till the whole power of Germany could be concentrated for the struggle in the West?

Or was it because Hitler had convinced himself that Britain and France would again accept the *fait accompli* when Poland

was destroyed and that all he need do, therefore, was to protect his Western frontier from invasion and to avoid inflaming the temper of the allies until the *fait accompli* could be presented? Or, again, was it because he knew that no far reaching bombing attack could be carried out without involving civilians and that he feared reprisals? Probably all three considerations influenced him and led to the amazing result that in the first 6 weeks of the War not a bomb was dropped by either side on the Western front except those used in purely naval operations.

The political and moral losses Germany accepted in order to achieve her victory in Poland, and they, of course, have great Military significance, and may have an even greater effect on the final result of the War than the Military opportunities she sacrificed. Hitler's bargain with Russia has cost Germany direct access to Roumania, and has placed her absolutely in Stalin's power for the continuance of the supplies of food and raw material she needs for carrying on a long War now that she is cut off from overseas supplies. Stalin has interpreted the bargain in a sense which has enabled him to control the resources of the Baltic States, to say nothing of the pressure he can exercise on the Balkan States which depend on Black Sea ports.

So long as he uses his power to her benefit Germany may have gained something by the bargain, though economists doubt the ability of Russia to meet Germany's requirements. Russia and her subordinate countries certainly cannot meet them all. That the bargain has alienated neutrals formerly benevolent, or at least not hostile, must be taken into account as must also the loss of prestige Germany has suffered by the willing or unwilling concessions made to Russia. To all the world it must be obvious that the political strategy, which hitherto has served Hitler so well, has at last led him into difficulties, the magnitude of which is proved by the desperate efforts he has made to escape them. If Hitler himself is disturbed by the situation in which he finds himself, what must his General Staff think of the problem he has set them?

With winter coming on, a civil population already suffering great hardships, and at the best uncertain economic prospects ahead, an early victory over the Allies is almost essential. The

General Staff by this time can have little hope that Britain will be brought to her knees by submarine warfare or air attack on shipping. Either victory must be achieved by the German Army or by air attack on the morale of the Civil population. With the French Army fully mobilized, holding strongly fortified positions, and backed by a powerful and ever growing British contingent, how can an early and decisive defeat be afflicted on the Allies. And how can ruthless air warfare be waged without endangering the German civilian population, whose morale cannot be entirely relied upon ?

A direct attack on the French defensivelines may be attempted, but the prospects of anything beyond a partial success, if experience of the last war is any guide, are remote. If France were exhausted after a long struggle possibly such an attack might succeed, but with her Army fresh, and with no shortage of men or material, the utmost that could be expected is that she might be driven back on to the main defence of the Maginot Line, and that only at great cost. If the German General Staff shrinks from such an enterprise will they attempt to turn the French main defences by violating neutral territory—possibly with the hope that the Allied Armies would be drawn out of their defences in their efforts to prevent the countries invaded falling into German hands. If it were earlier in the year, and weather conditions more favourable, the Germans might be tempted by their success in Poland to try the alternative by one route or another. Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg and Switzerland can none of them hope by its own efforts to repel invasion. Switzerland, however, without Italian co-operation, is an unpromising line of approach to France ; and with every week that passes Holland and Belgium increasingly become unattractive countries in which to carry out mobile operations. Luxemburg has no defence or Army with which to oppose an invader, and at this time of year, perhaps, a limited turning movement through the Duchy, combined with a direct attack on part of the present front of contact, may be the most probable development : Luxemburg, however, contains many hilly and forest covered areas which would not offer opportunities for the use of German armoured formations. Moreover, when the French frontier was reached, a formidable position would be

encountered, as the Maginot Line, in less elaborate form, has now been extended along the Northern frontiers of France.

There can be little doubt that, if there were not an economic urge for a quick victory, the Germans would prefer to stand on the defensive, hoping that the Allies would be compelled to attack. With time on his side, and with constantly growing strength, there is little prospect of General Gamelin giving up his cautious and life sparing tactics. Nor, in its present temper, is public opinion, either in this country or France, likely to put pressure on him to do something sensational.

So far operations on the Western front have been of an exploratory character but we have arrived at the beginning of the real war, so Hitler tells us. The main German army and air force have been transferred from East to West, although probably many formations are held back in reserve, so far behind the front that little indication has been given as to where they will be employed. How many troops have been left as an army of occupation to keep the hostile population of Germany's recently acquired territories in control we do not know. This number is probably large but as, presumably, they would not be first line troops that would not entail a serious diminution of Germany's striking force—unless, indeed, it was thought advisable to hold back some reliable first line troops to keep an eye on Soviet activities.

The maintenance of a large Army of occupation cannot but add to Germany's labour difficulties and, thus, by interfering with munition production, influence major operations. This is another item to be added to the list of troubles now confronting the German General Staff as a result of their victory in Poland.

II. THE SEA

BY ADMIRAL SIR HERBERT RICHMOND

THE extent to which the ships of the fleet are vulnerable to attack from the air, and the effects of that vulnerability upon the operations of the fleet, are questions which naturally arise in every one's mind. The problem is a new one, to which no very positive answer can be made from experience, for the air operations of the wars in Spain and China were conducted on too small a scale, and under conditions of efficiency so different from those of the present war, that they afford no conclusive evidence of what may happen in this larger struggle.

The aircrafts' weapons are the bomb, the torpedo and the machine gun. To what extent are the ships of the Navy vulnerable to these weapons and in what conditions is it to be expected that the course of events will be affected by them?

The vulnerability of a ship depends upon several factors. Of these the first, and outstandingly the most important, is the efficiency of her anti-aircraft armament. No defence is so effective as that which either destroys the attacker or deters him from approaching close enough to his target to make accurate shooting. Both the bomb and the torpedo are slow moving missiles and they are discharged from a very rapid-moving platform; hence a very close approach is necessary to obtain a hit, though random shots may find a billet. The improvements which have been made in anti-aircraft artillery in recent years have developed them into very different weapons from those that used to be called "Archibalds"; and so far we have seen very little inclination to press home attacks in face of their fire. Possibly that may come later: but it would seem proper to expect that the practice which guns have now obtained from their encounters will proportionately improve their skill.

The second factor is the static defence provided by the armour of the decks and by the underwater construction of the ships in the form of what are known as "bulges" and subdivisions

of the hull. No ship can be made invulnerable to injury but there is a wide gap between injury and destruction or disablement. While the great ships have the protection afforded by armour, the smallest—the destroyers—have the protection of their smallness, their speed and their powers of manœuvre. Air attack upon a fleet at sea, supposing it to consist of a body of the great ships with their attendant flotillas, would have therefore to pass through a zone of barrage fire of a very considerable intensity before it could reach a position close enough to make any except “browning” shots. Certainly thick weather may favour an approach and contribute to surprise, and luck may bring about a meeting unexpectedly as it has often done in war ; in which conditions—conditions which, it is understood, obtained in the attack upon the German ships in Kiel—hits must be expected ; but even then the artillery may also be expected to take a sharp toll of the attackers ; and, as that attack showed, a ship hit is not a ship destroyed though she may be temporarily crippled to a larger and smaller degree. Ships are built to sustain injury and a single bomb is no more to be expected to be decisive than a single shell ; and we have seen in past actions between ships how many hits a well constructed man-of-war can suffer without being put out of action.

What, however, is the position of ships in harbour ? At sea they have the advantage of being in movement. In harbour they are motionless and, in some harbours, they may be moored very close to each other. If a fleet is to perform its duties it must occupy a position from which it can move to intercept any movement made by the enemy. The range of modern aircraft is such that the bases from which the fleets and squadrons of the Navy must operate are within the range of aircraft. Does this mean that it is impossible for ships to use those bases, that they must withdraw to more distant positions ? I do not think this would be a proper conclusion. Defence against aircraft in harbour consists in a combination of warning of approach, of obstructions in the air which force the attacking craft to fly at a considerable height, and batteries of guns both on shore and on board ; and to these is to be added the counter attack of local aircraft in many circumstances. No one could say that these measures furnish immunity or prevent aircraft from penetrating

so positions from which they could discharge their bombs, as the gun batteries, booms, breakwaters, nets and mines prevent the surface torpedo craft and the submarine from pushing into an anchorage. But it may be with confidence assumed that the combination of obstructions and artillery will force attacking craft to fly at a height which will render accurate aim impossible though injuries may be suffered from the random shots or indeed from some bold spirits who are prepared to take extreme risks. But here let us bear in mind that the dangers of the sea off Brest or Rochefort did not deter the British fleets from maintaining their position off those ports, exposed though they constantly were to the dangers of shipwreck, to the straining of their hulls and the loss of their spars. The old seaman faced these dangers and became expert in so doing. So to-day we can no longer look upon the spells in harbour as spells of complete rest but, like our predecessors, accept the fact that like them we have to be perpetually *en vedette*. And in the same way as it was then necessary that there should be a margin to allow for repairs and refits, so to-day a margin is necessary. With the great repairing establishments, themselves effectively protected, we shall not be guilty of undue optimism in expecting that the strength can be maintained.

Events move quickly in war, and often unexpectedly. Methods of attack which when first attempted fail are improved and result in success ; for there is no such word as "impossible" in war. While therefore we cannot draw any final conclusions from such attacks as have taken place from the air up to the time of writing (mid-October), we can nevertheless look with some reasoned satisfaction on the prospect, and the results of the efficiency of modern anti-aircraft artillery in ship-defence. Our own aircraft which attacked the German ships in Kiel met with a very warm reception in spite of the weather conditions of their approach, and in both the engagements which have taken place between squadrons of enemy aircraft in the North Sea the attacking craft, though working in respectable numbers, caused no injury and themselves appear to have suffered some losses.

The battleship, owing to her armour, and the destroyer owing to her size, have each a form of passive defence. The cruiser,

less armoured than the former and larger than the latter, lies between the two in vulnerability. She will depend therefore more upon her armament ; but as that is the prime factor in security she is not to be considered much lower in the scale than them. Finally, the submarine. Judging from the experience of these first weeks of war she appears to be the most vulnerable of all types. Thus the Secretary of State for Air has told us that during the first four weeks of war submarines were sighted on 72 occasions and attacked on 34, with " undoubtedly successful " results in some of the attacks. " We have confirmed ", he said, " from prisoners' statements that the mere presence of an aircraft is sufficient to make a submarine submerge and remain submerged, and that the presence of an air escort often prevents a submarine from attacking a convoy." This is a satisfactory situation. The submarine occupies a more important place in enemy strategy than in our own, for it is no purpose of ours to sink enemy merchant ships : we control shipping by our surface ships, and it is the submarine which, in Captain Castex's so much discussed pronouncement of a few years ago, acts as a martingale to the freedom of movement of naval squadrons. So, while the aircraft are an undoubted hindrance and a new danger to fighting ships, the type which they, so far as we can see, hinder most is that which is the greatest nuisance to ourselves and our Allies.

III.—THE AIR

BY AIR-COMMODORE L. E. O. CHARLTON

THE curious condition of partially suspended animation in the air is still obtaining on the Rhineland front and signs are not as yet apparent of a coming change. Nor is there any indication of a forthcoming offensive in the air similar to that which harried the inhabitants of Poland throughout the length and breadth of that unhappy country. What activity there is still belongs to a preliminary and preparatory stage of flight. There have been some bold reconnaissances by air and, by now, what we and our allies do not know about the dispositions of the Siegfried Line must be hardly worth the knowing. Among these, four especially stand out in couples as notable, respectively, for failure and success. In the former case our aircraft, apparently unescorted, flew at height and in each of these flights they were attacked in outnumbering force by Messerschmidts, which sprang on them from above and inflicted heavy loss. In the latter instance our aircraft were flying low, with the result that they were unmolested and flew back with complete reports.

One wonders, rather, at the fact that the high-fliers went out unattended on so short a flight, for the inference is obvious that they were engaged in reconnoitring the rearward approaches to the Siegfried system. Otherwise there would appear to be little purpose in the dangerous expedition. In the case of long, back area reconnaissances it is understandable that aircraft must take their chances with the enemy unsupported. The fuel capacity of fighters does not permit them to stay up long or fly too far afield. But on a short reconnaissance over a lap of country which contains such closely guarded secrets as the Siegfried Line, and which the enemy is therefore particularly concerned to patrol with vigilance, it seems to be asking for trouble if the reconnoitring machines are left entirely to their own device. In the last war our aircraft employed on such missions were supposed to be indirectly protected by a constant

patrol of fighters which flew high up and well over the line. It was a rashly expensive system and brought us heavy loss, for a damaged aircraft meant descent in enemy territory, whereas, nearer home, the pilot might have struggled back. In the aggregate our air losses exceeded those of the enemy in the proportion of four to one, and would have occasioned a deterioration of our pilot personnel had the war gone on. Heaven forbid we should adopt such tactics now, for there is a mean between perpetual patrol and lack of all protection in the provision of an escort system for reconnoitring aircraft of which their missions do not take them far away. Our casualties on these two occasions explode the idea that a bomber flight in close formation is impervious to attack by fighters, though it is well to note that the enemy did not go off scot free. The account of these affairs, as issued to the Press and B.B.C., relates that the enemy broke off the engagement as soon as he had had enough. It is much more likely that all his ammunition was expended, for the aero-machine gun rate of fire is so rapid, and the mountings themselves so many, that it is impossible to sustain long combat in the air to-day.

An interesting point appears in the statement of one of the pilots who flew successfully at hedge-hopping height while reconnoitring the Siegfried system. It may be remembered that the only opposition encountered was from a solitary machine gun on the ground, and that the enemy below waved fraternal greetings as the flight passed low overhead, in the mistaken belief that the aircraft were their own. In his statement this pilot said that at one time he detected Heinkels up above and so flew low in order to foil the possibility of an attack. The lower one flies, with modern aircraft, the safer one remains from air attack. At the excessive speed of flight to-day it is impossible for an attacker to manœuvre for approach if his would-be victim is flying low. He cannot come up from under to take advantage of a blind spot, and fall away again to repeat the process. Neither can he make a diving onset from above, for miscalculation by a split second would cause a collision with the ground. Low flying, quite low down, is also safer from the point of view of anti-aircraft ground attack, excepting, perhaps, from machine guns on a pivot mounting. In the case of bigger armament the

sights cannot be aligned on a target that is whisking by at a speed of about a fifth the rate of sound, while the gunner is powerless to follow such a fleeting object flying by just overhead. By day, and in the dusks of twilight and of dawn, this war may see the development of low flying into a recognized system as providing large immunity from ground and air attack.

The enemy's efforts to bomb our ships-of-war have so far been unavailing, and even in the case of solitary destroyers, ill-armed against air attack, they have had no measure of success. It is nearly for a positive pronouncement on the subject, but Nazi air tactics over water have not been notable for enterprise, and the offensive spirit so far shown has suffered check through loss. No air attacks on convoys have been recorded, and no advantage has been taken of the opportunity to bomb neutral shipping lying in the roadsteads for inspection as to contraband. We hear of the fairly frequent appearance of enemy reconnaissance aircraft over the North Sea, but they have found no prey to speak of and, when encountered by our own reconnoitring machines, they have so far been worsted in the combat.

Meanwhile there has been an entire absence of raiding in the large sense of the word. It seems, in this respect, that an unpremeditated truce still reigns, both combatants being reluctant to release the mischief that would ensue. This was clearly shown in Hitler's Reichstag speech when he described the reciprocal results, on either border of the Rhine, of long artillery duels and bombing attacks if his peace efforts were brought to nothing. If it is true, as one hears, that the German population as a whole go unprovided with gas masks, and must purchase, if they are desired, at the people's own expense, it is easily understandable that he himself is anxious to postpone the evil day which will unmask him as a boaster when he claims his native air to be inviolable from air attack, and Goering's Air Force to be irresistible. To manufacture 80 million gas masks is a tall order for a country which is short of rubber for the face-piece, and the manufacturing energy of which is wholly absorbed in other, and more important, war activities. It is a well-known fact, moreover, that the compound material 'Buna', which is the Nazi substitute for rubber, cannot be used in the manufacture of masks. It would not be surprising if gas were

altogether eschewed as a weapon from the air, and the same, in less degree, might be applied to full scale city bombing, the boomerang effect of which is liable to hit the enemy hardest.

At present both sides would appear to be economizing on their air power, which is no more than the soundest commonsense. To undergo air losses for an insufficient reason would be courting danger, for the lesson of Poland has taught us once for all what happens when a country is deprived of air power. It spells defeat. Next in importance to a due economy is a continuing ability to replace wastage in material and personnel, as also to provide a reserve for necessary expansion. It is all the more enheartening, therefore, that we are to make such full use of our Empire resources in both, building up an accessory air power in the Dominions, in Canada especially, which before long will provide for all contingencies and safeguard the situation. It is a bold and well-considered scheme and repeats on more massive scale the part played by Canada in the last war in ensuring the flow of trained personnel to fill the gaps among the pilot ranks. On that occasion our training organization out there provided more than 200 fully trained pilots monthly during the last year of the war, and brought a huge relief to those who until then, had been faced with the prospect of increasing difficulty in the production of this vital reinforcement. The present scheme is more embracing still, including as it does the advanced training in every branch of flight of elementary graduates from Australia, New Zealand and, even, home. Parallel with it runs a companion scheme for material production of aircraft and accessories, so that the training can be carried out on Dominion manufactured aircraft and the organization, as a whole, can be self-supporting. With such foresight and Imperial co-operation our air power cannot fail.

STALIN'S NEW POLICY

BY WILLIAM J. OUDENDYK, K.C.M.G.

DJUGASHVILI and Bronstein fell out over the true meaning of dead Ulianov's utterances. It lead to a great feud which definitely divided the leaders of the Communist Party in Soviet Russia. Stalin won and Trotsky lost ; Lenin was no more.

Stalin proclaimed as his policy that, above all, Soviet Russia had to be made into a militarily and industrially powerful country, and that socialism had first to be firmly established in one single country alone. He did not care whether his work was in strict agreement with Lenin's sayings. After all Lenin himself had not been able to make his Utopian theories work in practice. But let there be no doubts about Stalin's ultimate aims. He rejected Trotsky's ways of spreading Bolshevism over the world but he himself did not renounce that ideal. Far from it. In 1932, on the occasion of the fifteenth anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, he laid stress on his mission to lead the revolutionary elements in foreign countries to the final and complete overthrow of the existing forms of government. "Be not impatient," he said, "and do not chafe at delays ; universal war has now become inevitable and is not far distant."

So he struck out along his own lines and in his first Five-year Plan he pursued industrialization and peasant "collectivization", ruthlessly causing the country to endure hardships and privations. He did not hesitate to introduce measures utterly in contradiction with the elementary tenets of socialism.

Far from preparing the State to wither away, as Marx had asserted it should, Stalin developed it to its greatest power and efficacy. It became like a capitalists' board of company directors and the workers were deprived of their right to strike. Far from striving towards the development of a classless society in which "each would receive according to his needs", he

allowed the growing up of new social classes of officials, intellectuals, artists, etc., standing apart from the workers, and the old system was reintroduced of "giving to each according to his work".

It must be admitted that through this partial reversion to "capitalistic" methods, and assisted by immense credits which only "capitalistic" countries were able to furnish, he did succeed in building up an enormous industry and an enormous army and air force and thus accomplished to a very large extent what he had set out to do.

But the pace had been fast and the Russian workman cannot be changed overnight into a conscientious skilled labourer. Even the "Stakhanovists" who boasted so much about the amount of work they performed did not do more than the ordinary workmen in the West do as a matter of course. Much of what was created was shoddy and very bad, and discontent was heard in many quarters. This was awkward. Scapegoats had to be found. So it was discovered that every branch of industry and of the Administration was swarming with "enemies of the people", "wreckers" and "Trotskyists" among whom a veritable reign of terror was instituted which reached its height in 1937. The strange trials where every accused confessed his guilt according to the prosecutor's wishes are still in everybody's memory.

Stalin felt that he and he alone must remain in command, and together with the scapegoats for the failures in his endeavours he "liquidated" every one of the "Old Guard Bolsheviks" as well as the military leaders whom he believed or suspected to be an opponent or a potential rival. In his speech on the 3rd March, 1937, he mentioned Germany and Japan as the countries working hand in hand with the "Trotskyist wreckers".

It seemed to fit in with Stalin's new policy to grant the peoples of the U.S.S.R. a new and liberal constitution and even a parliament. His promise in 1935 was hailed by all the Soviets' sympathizers throughout the world as another sign of Russia's desire to tread the path of true democracy. Others, however, who studied the situation closely, saw that Stalin here also had followed his usual tactics of making those ideas his own which he saw being entertained by a majority at the council table. He

felt that a Parliament might curtail his powers, but he cleverly took the lead and became president of the preparatory commission. The "Supreme Council" as this new parliamentary institution was to be called, came into being in 1937. The whole of the election work, however, had been entirely and strictly official, no chance was given to "class-aliens", and when this "Parliament" met with Stalin as its president, it proved in reality to be nothing more than a Hall of Praise and Assent like the Reichstag in Berlin. It did not in any way diminish Stalin's position as the centre of all power. But a queer sequence was that most of the members of the preparatory commission soon were numbered amongst those who were buried with a bullet in the back of their heads.

As a practical politician, Stalin realized that the exhaustion after the completion of his Five-year Plan might lead to general discontent. Creating a heavy industry and a powerful army would be of little use if the people were feeling that there was little in the country worth defending. Abandoning internationalism was seen to be insufficient, and the notion of a Russian fatherland had to be revived. The well-worn war bogey came in handy for this purpose and Stalin never omitted in his speeches to refer to foreign countries as enemies ready to attack Russia out of sheer jealousy. At the same time many old "bourgeois" rights were re-established as that of ownership, inheritance, and sale of agricultural produce to enhance the general feeling of well-being.

As exports to the "capitalistic" countries remained of the same importance as the obtaining of huge credits in order to be able to reconstitute everything that had been ruthlessly smashed in the early exhilaration of the Revolution and to realize the grandiose schemes of the next Five-year Plan, a certain stability in world affairs was necessarily considered a prerequisite. Thus we come to Stalin's New Policy in Soviet Russia's foreign relations, a question which naturally interests the outside world much more than the evolution which he brought about in the internal conditions of his country.

Here he, again, boldly struck out an entirely new line which not only his friends but also many liberals abroad greeted and applauded as the surest sign of a sincere change of heart. It

was a comforting thought to many that the Comintern was losing its dangerous aspect, that the scheme of world revolution had been relegated to the rear and that henceforth the great Soviet Republic intended to work in harmony with the democracies.

It must not be lost sight of, however, that the Comintern, although its history contains ups as well as downs, could boast of few if any lasting successes, and that on the whole it must have caused the men in Moscow not a few bitter disappointments that Marx's social revolution persisted in staying away.

Stalin's scheme was more subtle and far-seeing. It was much less provocative than the Comintern's activities. The word revolution was to be never or seldom heard. Peace and collaboration were the new watchwords. They dated from 1933-34 and combined Stalin's socialist philosophy with Russia's national exigences.

Japan had left the League of Nations in a truculent mood. She was a potential enemy in the Far East who felt herself threatened by the "dangerous thoughts" so sedulously being instilled by Soviet Russia all over Eastern Asia and in China and Mongolia in particular. Germany had followed suit and had quitted Geneva after Hitler had unequivocally pointed in *Mein Kampf* to the Ukraine and Russia as the most desirable direction of German expansion. Moreover, he had made the fight against Bolshevism one of the main tasks of the German nation. Having these two countries bordering in the East and at close quarters in the West, things might at any moment become distinctly unpleasant for Moscow.

Stalin, no doubt influenced in this instance by Litvinov, then discovered that this "League of Collective Impotence", as the Bolsheviks had always irreverently dubbed the very consequential institution on the banks of Lake Leman, might with advantage be turned into an exceedingly useful instrument for the protection of the U.S.S.R. through "collective security". Besides, it fitted in with his bid for respectability for Soviet Russia among the nations. It was indeed nothing less than a master-stroke; it strengthened countless people in the illusion of the support of the U.S.S.R. for the peace of Europe, and it hid the fact from them that that country was seeking above all

to keep itself ready for the final and decisive struggle for the triumph of Bolshevism.

Litvinov played his part in Geneva with consummate skill. He had already shown his mettle during the Disarmament Conference when, without moving a muscle of his face, he urged universal and complete disarmament, which elicited from M. Madariaga the remark that the Russian bear would then be better able to hug the other animals to its breast.

The Bolshevik members on the League Council were always to be found on the side which stood for maintaining the existing state of things in Europe, which, as was clear to many, held within it only too numerous causes for conflict and war. This evidently suited them to perfection.

Joining the League of Nations, however, was only one item on the programme of the New Policy. There were other even more important items. Henceforth Bolshevik penetration in foreign countries had to be worked by collaboration between the communists and other political parties. The former had to pose as patriots instead of internationalists. Also adhesion of the Soviet trade unions to the International Federation of Trade Unions had to be achieved at all costs. The communist parties in the various countries were ordered by Moscow no longer to obstruct the military preparations of their respective governments by voting against the budget. Finally, they were forbidden to form a parliamentary group apart, but to seek alliances with socialist and radical parties, whom they were to persuade to accept their collaboration along constitutional lines. This was called the creation of a United or Popular Front. It was an ingenious device, thought out by Dimitrov, the talented secretary-general of the Comintern, for unobtrusively undermining the enemy bastions which had so obstinately withstood the Bolshevik frontal attacks. Political liberty, still existing in democratic countries, made the execution of this plan possible. One can imagine what would happen in Soviet Russia herself if some such scheme were, *mutatis mutandis*, proposed there. The real object of the communist parties abroad was in the meantime never lost sight of, and Stalin himself was very instructive on this point when he said at the Congress of March, 1939: "The principles of the sister-parties must consist in facilitating

the outbreak of a general war. . . . Revolutionary action on a large scale will only be possible if we succeed in exploiting the antagonism between the capitalistic states to precipitate them into an armed conflict."

A little example of what was implied was furnished in France after the September crisis of 1938 when the spectre of war stood grinning on the threshold. A sigh of relief was heaved all over Europe when that evil spirit was exorcized by Mr. Chamberlain and M. Daladier. Not so, however, in Soviet Russia, where disappointment over the safeguarding of peace was openly voiced. The communist Maire of the little French town of Vallauris resigned from the Party utterly disgusted by the action of the headquarters which, believing war to be inevitable had secretly asked all the members for the most detailed denunciations of their relatives and friends for the coming "terreur". These revelations were not relished by the Party, but they were an eye-opener for many who had believed Stalin's Russia to be without danger. In fact Russia had become so harmless that it was quite fashionable to pooh-pooh any idea that there was still subversive propaganda to be apprehended. Did not Comrade Maisky attend conferences on Collective Security, did he not give soothing lectures all over the country and go to dinner parties and social gatherings? It was deemed to show deeper political insight by asserting that Soviet Russia had changed her heart as well as her complexion.

Yet nothing had happened to demonstrate any change in the set purpose of the Russian Communist Party, of the Soviet Government or of the Comintern's organizations to create disorder abroad. "Led by the great Stalin, and commanded by Marshal Voroshilov, we the young people of the U.S.S.R. have the most important historic task—to decide who shall destroy whom in the whole world," cried Kosarev in the presence of Stalin, Voroshilov and Molotov at a Young Peasants' Conference in Moscow in January, 1936. The recent events in Poland are there to show that he boasted not in vain.

During this period of Soviet Russia's respectability and of her labours for peace there has not been a corner in the world where fighting has been going on where the Bolsheviks from Moscow have not had a hand in it. In China the generals first fought

among themselves with the aid of the Soviet Embassy in Peking, as the papers showed which were seized in the raid on the Russian barracks there in 1927. Only British tact and patience prevented hostilities breaking out between the British and the Chinese, instigated by Soviet Russia in the same year.

Under Moscow's guidance the youth of China never ceased clamouring for war with Japan. They and every Bolshevik never tired of denouncing General Chiang Kai-shek's policy as that of a traitor for whom no name was bad enough. In the end they succeeded through the well-known incident in Sian of December, 1936, to induce the men in Nanking to stiffen their attitude towards Japan, which led directly to that country's provocative action near Lu Kou Ch'iao in July, 1937. Moscow's goal was then reached and war has been raging ever since. It must be gratifying for Moscow to watch Japan exhausting her national resources in a war waged not against Soviet Russia.

Spain was already looked upon by Lenin as the most promising field for Bolshevik action from where his blessings could most conveniently be showered upon France and the rest of Western Europe. Under Stalin's New Policy it was there that the programme of the creation of a Popular Front, of strikes and disorders, civil war and the establishment of a Soviet government seemed to insure complete success. Large numbers of revolutionary experts were dispatched from Moscow; Rosenberg went as Ambassador to Madrid; Antonov-Ovseenko as Consul General to Barcelona. Everything appeared to be going according to plan. Unfortunately for Stalin the civil war went wrong. Meanwhile poor Spain had become the battlefield where Soviet Russia, Italy and Germany fought out their ideological differences.

Next to his action in Spain came that in France. A two-years' rule of the Popular Front played fast and loose with the country's economic position as well as with its finances. But the country saw through the scheme after the war scare of September, 1938, and far from falling asunder in internecine strife the whole nation was roused in the hour of danger by a wave of patriotism and rallied around democracy's high ideals.

It being so evident that Stalin's peace policy was absolutely insincere and nothing else than a masked gesture for leading the

world into war, it seems almost incredible that responsible statesmen of Great Britain and France could have entertained the slightest hope of inducing that great Bolshevik leader to join a Peace Front. Nothing could be further from that man's mind. His own utterances as well as those of his collaborators and the expositions of Soviet Russia's policy were there to prove this.

In my book *Ways and By-ways in Diplomacy*, published last August, I wrote in the Epilogue dated the 15th May, a warning against any optimism about the negotiations then going on in Moscow. I quoted Mecklis, chief of the political department of the Red Army, who on the 5th April declared once more that the invincible Soviet ship would be steered by her great captain Stalin to final combat with capitalism and to the triumph of communism in the whole universe. This was a grave warning considering the moment it was given. In connection with it I could not help cautioning against a repetition of the betrayal at Brest-Litovsk in March, 1918. Yet the British and French went on trying to win over the Soviet Government to some arrangement in the interest of peace. Did they rely on Stalin's noble statement of March, 1939, that he and his Government stood for the support of nations which are victims of aggression and are fighting for the independence of their country?

* * * * *

The Poles were victims of wanton aggression and were fighting desperately for the independence of their country. Stalin's army marched in on the 17th September and annexed two thirds of it.

On the 25th September the Polish officers who defended themselves in Vilna and Polish landowners were put against the wall and shot.

That was Stalin's Old Policy.

GERMANY AND THE ECONOMIC BLOCKADE

BY C. W. GUILLEBAUD

IN assessing the economic strength of Germany in relation to the blockade, it is well to recall the previous occasion on which this country found herself at war in Europe. In the last war Italy was a neutral, until September, 1915, and the United States till April, 1917. The greater part of the Poland which, under the new Russo-German agreement, is to be incorporated in Germany, lay either in the old Reich or in Austria. Austria-Hungary included, apart from Polish Galicia, the new Austria and Czechoslovakia, which are both within the orbit of the Greater Germany of to-day. On the other hand, the South Tirol is now Italian, Hungary is a neutral, and so are the considerable territories belonging to the old Austro-Hungarian Empire which now form part of Yugoslavia and Rumania. Of former belligerents, Belgium, Turkey and Bulgaria are still neutral, while Russia is linked up with Germany, though her precise relationship is, and may very possibly remain, ambiguous. It is this last difference, which on the face of it, affords the greatest contrast with the situation in 1914. Finally, Alsace and Lorraine, which then belonged to Germany, now form part of France.

It is not sufficient, however, to take the situation as it was in August, 1914, for within a few weeks it had changed profoundly to the detriment of the Entente Powers. Belgium was rapidly overrun, and the richest engineering, coal and textile producing areas of Northern France had fallen into the hands of Germany. In the East the most important industrial districts of Russian Poland had been, or were in process of being, acquired by Germany.

Over and above the general economic dislocation caused by these events, and the additional strain thrown upon Great Britain and the Empire, there was a disastrous weakening of

the vital resources of the Allies, due to the losses they had incurred in coal, iron and steel.

Before August, 1914, the annual coal producing capacity of the Allies (France, Great Britain and Belgium) was 425 million tons against 365 million tons in the case of the Central Powers. By the end of September, 1914, the invasion of France, Belgium and Russian Poland had almost exactly reversed the position. The coal capacity of the Allies at the pre-war rate of output was only 370 million tons as compared with 430 million tons in the hands of the Central Empires. In the case of iron and steel the Allies' annual iron capacity before the war was $22\frac{1}{2}$ million tons and that of the Central Powers $21\frac{1}{2}$ million tons. Here the tables were turned even more effectively, for within two months the iron capacity (again on a pre-war basis) of the Allies had fallen to 16 million tons and that of the Central Powers had risen to $27\frac{1}{2}$ million tons. It was only the power, which the command of the sea and the great financial strength of the Allies gave them to draw on the resources of the rest of the world, above all the United States and also Canada, that in all probability, saved them from military defeat.

If we turn now to the present war, we find so far as coal is concerned that England and France on the one side, and Germany on the other side, are amply supplied with coal for all their requirements, though France is likely to have difficulties with providing coke for her Lorraine ores. The principal limiting factor in all these countries is labour.

In the case of iron and steel the output of steel in 1937 in the German Reich (1937 boundaries) was approximately 20 million tons, as compared with just over 21 million tons for England and France. If the whole of the steel output of the then Poland together with Austria and Czechoslovakia be added to the German total for 1937, her output figure would rise to just over 24 million tons.

But this presents the situation in much too favourable a light for Germany. For the ultimate basis of steel is iron ore (apart from scrap), and here Germany is very deficient. Whereas in 1914 she produced much of her ore within her own territory (she then held the Lorraine ore fields), in 1937 she produced only $27\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. (in 1938 about 33 per cent.) of her total

consumption of ore, so that she had to import over 70 per cent. Moreover, her most recent acquisitions have not helped her in this respect, both Czechoslovakia and Poland being importers of iron ore on balance. Although she has been working feverishly to expand the output of her domestic ores and has constructed the vast Hermann Göring Works at Salzgitter, the ores are of very low grade and are not the equivalent of the ores she had been importing from France and other countries. At the same time the seriousness of the dependence upon foreign supplies is lessened by the fact that so long as she controls the Baltic she can draw large quantities from Sweden—always provided that she can pay for them. But even the whole of the export of iron ore from Sweden to all destinations in 1937 did not amount to more than 50 per cent. of Germany's total consumption in that year.

If iron and steel and coal were, as has been stated, the fundamental bases of the last as they are of the present war, another product—oil—must be added to-day, owing to the vital importance of the air arm in modern warfare. Now in 1937 Germany imported approximately 4,300,000 tons of mineral oil. Of this total, 3,100,000 tons came from the American Continent and only 300,000 tons from Russia and 520,000 tons from Rumania. When it is remembered that a mechanized army, with an air force on a war basis, is likely to require much greater amounts of petrol and other oils, especially lubricating oil, than correspond to normal consumption in time of peace, it can be seen what a formidable problem confronts Germany in the organization of her oil supplies.* No doubt she can, in theory, greatly expand her imports of oil from Rumania, but this raises very serious questions of finance and transport which will be considered later.

Turning next to food, it is clear that the Germans have profited by the experience of the last war when they failed to ration consumers at the outset, and later fixed rations which had to be progressively reduced as the war continued, and

*In 1937 Germany produced from her own wells only 11 per cent. of her total domestic consumption of crude oils. But taken by itself this figure, which has been often quoted, exaggerates the degree of her dependence on foreign supplies. Thus the figures for 1938 show that, while her output of crude natural oil did not exceed 553,000 tons, her output of synthetic fuels (chiefly from lignite) was 1,700,000 tons; in the same year she imported approximately 5,000,000 tons in all of mineral oils.

which, partly owing to faulty distribution and control, were by no means always maintained. Now they have begun by announcing rations, which—though meagre—can probably be maintained (with the important exception of fats) for a long time to come. There will no doubt be local and temporary shortages due to transport difficulties, such as have already been reported from Berlin, but it would be easy to exaggerate their importance when considering the country as a whole.

Germany has very large stocks of food accumulated from her recent good harvests, above all the bumper cereal harvest of 1938 ; she can probably continue to draw appreciable supplies from South Eastern Europe and possibly Denmark, and there seems little prospect of the German people being “starved into submission”. The women and children and the weakly (is it unpatriotic to welcome the fact ?) will not die of famine as so many of them did in the “fodder-beet winter” of 1916-1917. But the official ration of meat, fats and sugar is very small and the long-run effects of what doctors call “a low diet” are calculated to weaken the morale of the home front and to diminish the efficiency of a working population already tired and overstrained by the long hours and exhausting toil of the last twelve months of intense war preparations.

The value of the Russian alliance in the economic field is highly problematical, for it may be pointed out firstly that the Russia of to-day produces many of the things which Germany can export and that the kind of goods which Germany exported to South America and other countries are not likely to be what Russia will require ; secondly, that Russia is likely to want many products which Germany will need for her own war efforts ; thirdly, that Russia is far away, the communications in Poland must have been badly damaged by the war, and were at no time based on a large east-west traffic. Even if Russia is willing to supply raw materials on credit it will be very difficult, it may well prove impossible, to transport them in large quantities to Germany. Moreover, in recent years Russia has not appeared in the world markets as an exporter of large quantities of food or raw materials and there is no reason to suppose that she either could or would transport supplies

sufficient to make a big difference to Germany, to the north-western frontiers of her vast country.

Viewing Germany's foreign trade problem as a whole it would seem to turn on two main factors, transport and finance. She is cut off by the British Navy from all her overseas sources of direct supply other than from the Baltic countries, and she must re-orientate her supplies to travel over-land instead of the very much cheaper and easier method of sea-borne trade. In 1937 not more than one fifth of her total imports (measured in value) came to her from the countries to the east and south of her boundaries, while of the remainder by far the greater part was carried in ships before reaching a railhead on the European Continent. Most of this will be cut off by the blockade and what does get through will have to proceed by devious and round-about routes. It can readily be appreciated that, surrounded as she is by countries, whose means of communication in most cases is by no means highly developed, the mere change-over of the former lines of trade must raise transport problems of a formidable magnitude.

Even inside her own country she has great difficulties to face. Hamburg and Kiel and similar places on the north-west coast of Germany have always imported their coal from England; now that must all go by rail, and the German railways are known to have deteriorated considerably in recent years. During a few weeks in the winter of 1938-39, when hard frosts immobilized the inland waterways, and the whole burden had to be transferred to the railways, the latter proved incapable of taking the strain, and though some necessary repairs have since been effected to rolling stock and permanent way, too little time has elapsed and too much iron and steel have been needed for armaments and fortifications and public buildings, for the railways to have been restored to a high level of efficiency. Transport then, both within and outside Germany, is one of the weak spots in the German armour.

Another weak spot is the finance of her foreign trade. Unlike 1914, Germany has neither gold reserves nor appreciable holdings of foreign securities with which to pay for her imports. She must either export goods or obtain what she requires by means of credits. During the last year or two Germany has developed

her trade with South-Eastern Europe to a high degree. In 1938 the former German Reich, Austria and Czechoslovakia together did approximately 50 per cent. of the total export and import trade of Yugoslavia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Greece, combined. It does not seem probable that there is much room for further expansion here and there might well be a contraction. Thus the fact that many raw materials previously imported from overseas countries (*e.g.*, textile raw materials) are no longer available, will hit Germany's exporting industries which will not be able to supply what these countries need. At the same time the intensification of the demands of war upon man-power, materials and productive capacity in general must react adversely on Germany's ability to keep her exporting industries going on their pre-war scale. It may be objected that all the exporting capacity which previously went to buy overseas goods can now be concentrated on the neutral countries which border on Germany's frontiers. But here again it must be observed that Balkan peasants and British and American consumers do not want the same kind of goods. Of course, pressure of all kinds can be employed, but it was already being used before the outbreak of the war and to intensify it further *effectively* may not prove to be easy.

There remains the possibility of obtaining goods on credit. A victorious Germany might be both able and willing to honour her obligations, though the record of all belligerents in the last war can scarcely be regarded as encouraging in this respect. A vanquished Germany certainly could not pay. It can reasonably be presumed, therefore, that neutral countries, and Russia also, will not be over anxious to sell goods to Germany against nothing better than a promise to pay at some future date with industrial products—and the longer the war continues the more reluctant are they likely to become.

If we compare Germany with Great Britain and France there is one important difference. In the allied countries there was a considerable volume of unemployment before the war broke out and many industries were by no means working to capacity. There is, therefore, a great deal of slack in the economic system that can be taken up, and large reserves of productive resources that are available. The standard of living in both countries has

been relatively high in the immediate past, and that means that there are many superfluous things which have been produced and consumed, which can be dispensed with in war time without trenching upon the vital necessities of life. In Germany on the other hand, industry has been working to full capacity ever since the summer of 1938. Hours of work have steadily been increased, the dregs of the labour market have been drawn into employment, and the standard of living, as measured particularly by the quality of food and other consumption goods, has been falling. At the same time overwork and the dragooning of the population has produced symptoms of strain and tension which were commented on in the German Press already in the Spring of this year. Productivity per head in certain industries, *e.g.*, coal mining was showing signs of falling, the accident rate was rising alarmingly, quality was deteriorating. For several years now the German people has been kept working and living at high pressure and from the point of view of morale and endurance they may be said to have entered this war in much the same condition as they were in 1917 after they had been fighting a major war for three years.

But apart from the factor of morale, the economic difficulties of Germany are much intensified by the high pressure at which the whole system was working before the war. The withdrawal of millions of men from industry and agriculture and their absorption in the fighting services must involve more disturbance and dislocation than if the last ounce of effort had not already been mobilized. No doubt the accumulation of war materials that has been going on in recent years is very great, but modern war is an insatiable monster and must be continually fed by current output. Substitutes can be used for many of the things which Germany can no longer import, but they are firstly less efficient and secondly require much larger quantities of labour and productive resources for their manufacture.

This article has been mainly concerned with drawing attention to the chinks in the German armour and to the problems and difficulties with which she is faced. But there can be no graver error in a conflict than to under-estimate the strength of one's antagonist. Germany has devoted many years to making preparations against the eventuality of war and she is a very

powerful industrial country with great resources, at least for a short war. Nor are *all* the time factors against her even in a long war. She has conquered Poland and can use the labour of hundreds of thousands of Polish prisoners in her fields and mines. The re-organization of lines of transport is certainly a difficult problem and takes time, but it must be remembered that the Germans are great organizers, while their authoritarian system has the advantages of rapidity of decision and ruthlessness of method.

To show where the shoe pinches is not necessarily to prove that its wearer cannot walk, and it must be borne in mind that a German economist making a similar review of the economic situation of Britain and France, from the point of view of their capacity to stand a long war, would have no difficulty in picking out many problems with which we are confronted whose solution is likely to be far from easy. It would be unsafe to assume that the economic blockade by itself must speedily and inevitably reduce Germany to submission. The course of military events, the mastery of the air, the cohesion of the Government and of the Army, the willingness of the German people to endure sacrifices and still support their Government, these are ultimately the deciding factors. The economic factor is not so much a separate independent element as one which is a potent force influencing all the others; for military success depends largely upon material equipment; the mastery of the air is not merely a question of skill and bravery but also of supplies of oil and the quality and quantities of aeroplanes; while the unity of those in command, and the morale and solidarity of the home-front are affected, but not solely determined, by the degree of the sacrifices which must be borne by the population as a whole, as also by the prospects of ultimate success.

Finally, we hear much of economic warfare and have even established a Ministry of Economic Warfare. What can such a Ministry accomplish?

In the first place, it is pre-eminently a Ministry of Blockade. Direct supplies to Germany from overseas may be assumed to be kept out by the Navy. But the Ministry has the difficult and delicate task of seeing, that so far as possible, contraband

does not reach Germany through the channel of imports into neutral countries. Towards the latter stages of the last war this was accomplished with such thoroughness that neutrals were only allowed to import what they needed for their own domestic requirements, and if they sold goods to Germany it was at the expense of their own permitted quota reckoned on a very restricted basis. How far similar methods can be employed to-day remains to be seen.

Apart from this there is the control of finance, exercised through the different financial centres of the world, and directed to making it as difficult as possible for Germany to obtain the money with which to pay for such imports as she can still draw from outside. But even before this war by far the greater part of all German foreign trade was based on a direct exchange of goods against goods; it was predominantly bilateral rather than multilateral and therefore did not make much use of such instruments as bills of exchange drawn on London—in marked contrast with the situation in 1914. One important method, therefore, of preventing goods from reaching Germany, is to provide a market for products which otherwise would be sold to Germany and to furnish supplies of coal and similar things which otherwise these countries would have to draw from Germany. If we can do little by restricting financial facilities, we might be able to do much by replacing her in her own external markets. Every ton of Rumanian oil that we can buy means one ton of oil less which is physically available for export to Germany. For this purpose the most effective weapon that can be used against Germany, and one that should be in the front line of the economic blockade, consists in the greatest possible expansion of the export trade of this country, above all with the European neutral countries.

Thus on its economic side, the main strategy of the war consists in drawing the net so closely about Germany that what is within cannot get out and what is without cannot get in.

THE CONDITION OF FARMING AND ITS FUTURE

BY LORD ADDISON

THE war has brought into prominence once more the long neglect of the productive possibilities of our farm lands.

If only we could arrive at sufficient agreement on a scheme of agricultural policy that could be pursued steadily for a term of years, and that did not need a war to stir us up, it would be possible in less than a generation to make rural England more prosperous than ever, and something like what it ought to be.

The present emergency programme of increasing the acreage of arable land by a million and a half acres is on the right lines. If the land is wisely chosen and up-to-date methods are applied to its cultivation, it will provide a valuable instalment of what needs to be done. But, unless it is backed up by a sound long-term policy, its effects will be dissipated and we shall be presented by a repetition of the slump in cultivation that followed the last war.

If we remind ourselves of the main features of the present war-emergency programme and of the circumstances out of which it has arisen, we shall discern the causes of the decline that has taken place, because the rapid passage of land out of cultivation that followed the last war was only the continuation of a process that had been in operation for thirty years before.

The main feature of the present effort to secure the ploughing up of 1,500,000 acres of grassland is that it is accompanied by the payment of a premium of £2 per acre on land that has been down to grass for seven years or more. At present the premium is only payable if the land is ploughed up before the end of the year, but it is to be hoped that, owing to the exceptional dryness of the weather during September and the consequent difficulty of good ploughing on many lands, as well as because of the abundance of late grass, the date for earning the subsidy will

be extended to February or March. It is a necessary condition of the scheme that an appropriate food crop shall be harvested from the land in 1940. We may expect that a high proportion of the crop will be wheat.

The chief fact underlying all this is, that land, when ploughed and properly cultivated, will produce three times as much, or more, human or animal food, as the same land under grass unless it is an exceptional pasture. In this connection we should also remember that more than half the land that is at present grass would provide two or three times as much animal food weight per acre, even as pasture, if it were first ploughed and then, after arable tillage, re-seeded with good grass mixtures. It would be a good thing if some special inducement could be provided to encourage this being done in addition to corn growing, as it would increase the supply of animal feeding stuffs.

Professor Stapledon, whose main conclusions are now accepted, has put the acreage of land now down to grass that should be so ploughed up and re-seeded at no less than ten million acres.* If we put this immense extent of poor, food-yielding grass alongside the facts that since 1891 no less than 4,389,195 acres of land that were formerly ploughed and actively cultivated, have either been let down to poor grass or allowed to become derelict and ground for nettles, thistles, brambles and all manner of rubbish, we obtain a glimpse of the food-productive capacities that are at present wasted.

It is to be recognized that the steadiness introduced into milk prices by the Milk Marketing Board has contributed to an increase of grassland and to its better treatment, but to be set against this is the increased dependence on imported animal feeding stuffs that has accompanied the larger milking herds. In any case it does not alter the fact that much more animal feed can be produced from land ploughed and re-seeded than from good pastures.

This persistent and long continued decline in arable cultivation has been accompanied by other changes, which, in themselves, present a cumulative handicap on restoration. The increased dilapidation of farm equipment, the increasing extent of land

*Address at the Chartered Surveyors' Institution, January 11th, 1938.

that needs drainage, and the continued decline in the number of agricultural workers, are examples of these conditions.

The dilapidation of farm equipment, taking the country as a whole, is appalling. Farm buildings in a state of disrepair are almost universal in some districts with their roofs and walls in holes and the floors broken up. Farm yards becoming quagmires in wet weather, farm gates broken or patched up anyhow, and fences in a dreadful state are to be found almost everywhere.

Here and there, as we go about we see a cheering exception. Sometimes there is a farmer with plenty of capital and with special business qualities, or an owner possessed of some income other than that derived from farm rents that enables him to keep his estate buildings in good order ; but such cases are hard to find. A careful estimate was furnished to me, when I was Minister of Agriculture, of the expenditure that would be required to bring farm land equipment up to what it ought to be if work was to be conducted to the best advantage, and the figure was £250 millions. Every year that passes must increase the cost.

With regard to Drainage, a startling statement was issued in January of this year with the authority of the National Farmers' Union behind it.* It was to the effect that land fertility schemes cannot succeed "until the Government deals with the urgent problem of field drainage", and it was estimated that there were no less than "seven million acres of fields and pastures whose stock-carrying capacity could be immeasurably increased if they were once restored to a state of fertility".

I confess I was staggered at the figure of seven million acres ; because in the discussions on the Land Drainage Act in 1930 I had been led to talk about $2\frac{1}{2}$ million acres in these terms. But the larger figure may well be right, since field drainage has practically ceased for many years. In the present, war-time ploughing programme we are confronted by widespread reports of good land that it would be useless to plough up until it has been drained. But whatever the figure of acreage of land requiring drainage may be, it is certain that every year that passes will add to the cost of its reclamation.

The migration of Labour from the land has so long been

*Quoted in *The Farmers' Weekly*, January 20th, 1939, p. 20.

a commonplace amongst national lamentations that people have almost come to accept it as inevitable. The process has continued year after year and has even been accelerated recently so that we have lost a quarter of a million land workers during the past forty years or so, and the total number of those employed in agriculture has diminished by more than 25 per cent.

The main reason for this decline in employment is the decline in arable cultivation. They go together; because ploughed land employs, on an average, four times as many men per hundred acres as the same land under grass. The increased spread of mechanization has contributed to lessened employment; but it is to be noted that some well-managed large-scale farming enterprises, that make the fullest use of machinery, are found to give employment to more men than were previously occupied on the same land. The reason is that a fuller use is made of the land and more stock is carried that requires labour in its management. Where large-scale enterprises are concerned with the production of market-garden supplies the increase in the labour employed on the same land has sometimes been very substantial; so that, with up-to-date methods, machinery does not displace human labour to as great an extent as might be supposed.

* * * * *

The main causes of the decline in agriculture are not far to seek. They may be summarized as follows:—

Complete uncertainty of price, and often long continued depressions in price, have undermined the confidence of farmers. They have led to widespread impoverishment, and driven younger men in thousands to other occupations. These price-depressions have sometimes been almost freakish in their character, and out of all proportion to changes in supplies, whether from home or foreign sources. The fall in sheep and barley prices, for example, two years ago when good lambs or good barley made less than half, or about half, what they made the year before, is perhaps the latest illustration. No industry can be carried on successfully on this insecure basis.

These price depressions, together with other circumstances—such as the effect of Death Duties—have led to a progressive impoverishment of land-owners so that the former, landlord-

tenant, partnership has almost disappeared. The landlord used to provide and maintain buildings, contribute to the cost of land drainage, supply lime and otherwise assist in the maintenance of fertility, but this has almost ceased to exist. The case also is little better with the multitude of owner-occupiers who bought their farms after the last war. In most cases they only could do so by the aid of heavy mortgages which left them very short of working capital, so that, in the mass, it only meant the exchange of one owner who was hard up for another in the same plight.

The chief blame for all this, in my judgment, rests, not on the landlord or the farmer, but upon ourselves as a Nation. For the last two generations, those, who have been most influential in determining the character of national industrial policy, have had their minds on overseas investments and markets. They have been looking at distant lands and have not noticed our own fields. It seems to require a war to make them realize the folly of this oversight.

There is no more significant illustration of this national frame of mind than has been provided by war departments for years past—and is now being provided. I have before my mind's eye a great extent of splendid land that was taken by a war department and an excellent tenant turned out. The land is used, in bits, it is true, but a large part of it is growing thistles and weeds instead of corn. In another case a great industrial enterprise bought a large tract of land to work the chalk beneath. For years most of it has reverted to a waste. Just now, happily, 140 acres that could not possibly be used by the industry for years to come, are being reclaimed in the war-time ploughing programme.

These instances of prodigality and waste of land are symptomatic of a point of view. National policy should demand that we use our precious land with frugality and forbid this reckless waste. There is no question of the productive capacity of our land. There is no question of the high quality of farming knowledge and experience to be found in the country, although the industry has been so steadily depleted of enterprising young men. The wonder is that so much has survived. There is no question of the excellence of our livestock and many other

products. We possess, moreover, the best food market in the world.

* * * * *

What can we do to arrest this process, and to secure the application of common sense and modern knowledge to our land so that the use is made of it that every experienced person knows to be right and possible? I suggest that success cannot be achieved unless we can secure these three things *together*.

1. Such an up-to-date Equipment of the land as will enable a proper use to be made of it.
2. A Price-system that can be relied upon; that will enable a competent cultivator to use the land for the best food-production purposes, so that he will know that, if he does so, he will have a decent living for himself, and be able to provide good wages and working conditions for those whom he employs.
3. Such conditions of employment and living for the worker as will satisfy him and his family, and make him wish to stay on the land.

It would be too long a story to develop these three suggestions at length, but an indication of what they appear to involve should be given.

As regards the first: I am convinced myself that there is no other way in which the vast amount of money required for farm equipment, drainage, water supplies and the rest, can be provided on an acceptable basis, except by making it a national responsibility, and this expenditure could only be based on the public ownership of farmlands.

I am well aware of the objections that may be brought to such a proposal. It would be the responsible duty of those in charge to frame and administer the scheme so as to meet these objections fairly so far as they possess reality. No system can succeed that was swathed in 'red tape' or that smacked of "farming from Whitehall" or that failed to give full scope for initiative and for a variety of methods of farming and management.

There would require to be a Central Land Fund with separate Bonds representing those issued for Compensation on purchase and those required for Development and Equipment purposes. It would be necessary also to have a fair-rent system that did not saddle individual holdings with an excessive burden because of equipment expenditure. With the low rates of interest

possible on public borrowings it would certainly provide a great relief to many present owner-occupiers with heavy mortgages at high rates of interest.

I can imagine no better national investment. It would remove a hundred obstacles that stand in the way of the well-planned development of re-equipment, of a rational water-supply system, of a proper scheme of drainage, of afforestation and many more. It would also secure the preservation of amenities and rural beauties far more effectively and expeditiously than the present tangle of inoperative Planning Schemes.

It is necessary to say that, however fair and sensible might be the national system of land management, it could not succeed in restoring agriculture unless it were accompanied by arrangements that provided the competent agriculturalist with a fair and reliable Price System.

It is imperative that agriculture should be free from the price uncertainties that have paralysed it in times past. It is the only major industry that conducts its operations on the basis of a gamble; and it is useless to expect that the long-term tillage operations, required on a great scale, will ever be carried out if the industry is to be the victim of these periodic price slumps. The seasons cannot be controlled; but bulk supplies, bulk distribution and prices can. I am convinced the public would support the endeavour, vast and difficult as it would be, if they were satisfied that the consumer was not being exploited whilst necessary safeguards were being provided for the home producer.

I do not believe myself that a system of commodity subsidies can survive. The right principle to secure is that, where both home and imported produce enter into the total supplies, the end-price should be as moderate as an efficient marketing system can make it, whilst containing within it a proper payment for the home producer.

The business would have to be managed on a Commodity, or a grouped-Commodity, basis and the levy subsidy principle on imports would certainly enter into the final price on the wholesale market in some cases.

It could undoubtedly be managed. But it would involve drastic changes in our present system of distribution, and it is

useless to shut one's eyes to this fact. Retail prices are often out of all proportion to what the producer receives. But, with goodwill and resolution, the difficulties could be overcome and I believe that the endeavour would enlist the assistance of the best men engaged in marketing operations.

A good standard of wage arises out of, and must be associated with a reliable price system. The agricultural worker is a highly skilled worker. He deserves a good home and a good standard of life, and his children are entitled to have hope in the land where they were born and not feel compelled to drift away from it.

Notwithstanding all that has been done in Housing since 1919, the problem of the agricultural labourer's cottage has scarcely been touched. The recent survey proves this up to the hilt. If it, with other records, is a guide, we need at least 250,000 decent well-provided cottages for agricultural labourers. They are entitled to them; and when a son wants to get married he should be reasonably certain of a good cottage instead of having to drift off to a town to start his home.

The achievement of Agricultural Restoration—involving re-equipment, a sound price system and attractive labour conditions, calls for a progressive programme of development and above all, of consistent and well-directed management.

I should like to see a National Agricultural Commission operating on an agreed programme put in charge of the business.

There are certain lines of increased food production that cry aloud for encouragement, and particularly they relate to those classes of foodstuffs which our land is well fitted to produce, and which, as it so happens, the community requires much more of if it is to be properly nourished. Milk, butter, eggs, vegetables, and many fruits, stand out amongst these.

The programme also should take account of national security-needs where these are plainly associated with our productive capacity, and this means that our wheat production should be more than doubled, and that we should be much less dependent than we now are on the importation of animal feeding stuffs and meat.

The present danger of a stoppage of butter supplies from Denmark is demonstration enough of the existing absurd

position. With some of the finest milking herds in the world we produce less than 10 per cent. of our annual requirements of butter. But there is little hope of improvement so long as the farmer has to be content with 5½d. or so, per gallon for milk sent for butter making. This is a case in which a remedy could be found in a levy-subsidy system that brought imported foreign butter into 'hotch potch' so as to enable a better payment to be made for milk for manufacture. It could be done at half the cost of the present tariff.

It would be a delight to continue to develop this theme but I will satisfy myself by saying that there is to-day, I think, a greater measure of agreement amongst men of all parties on the necessity of agricultural restoration than ever before. If the war could lead to common action for a common purpose, a great good would have come out of it that might go far to compensate for the loss and misery it must otherwise inevitably entail.

REGIMENT OF WOMEN

BY GEOFFREY HOUSEHOLD

WE were discussing the failure of the General Strike of 1926, and had come to the usual and woolly conclusion that it was beaten by the ability of the public to run the essential services for themselves.

"No:" said Bill. "I was of the public, and I recognize my incompetence. So would you, if you had ever seen a big -6-2 Great Western locomotive stopped three yards from the east-bound tunnel in Earl's Court station."

I did see it. There must have been thousands of Londoners who saw it. At a platform meant for District trains skittering like mice from one hole to another was this great green monster which had never moved without space and due ceremony, immobilized, sweating steam, and obviously terrified. The arch into which it would have been driven, had the six-foot driving wheels made half a revolution more, was of less height than the boiler. This was before the rebuilding of the station, and the approach from the west was fairly open.

"Anarchy!" Bill went on. "The skilled workers couldn't stand it any more than a trained nurse can bear to see an ignorant mother pick the baby up wrong way round. They had no interfere or bust. It wasn't our ability that beat them; it was their horror at our inability."

Somebody said that paradox had no place in serious argument, and that the waiter was waiting. Bill pointed out that he had already ordered a pink gin and that since he was a papist—as it pleased him to call it—paradox was permitted to him. Had he been a Methodist, he said, we should have been slightly shocked at any sign of wit. Which proved the respect of the English for established rights. Which led to the necessity for caps with gold braid on them. Which brought us to the Great Western locomotive in Earl's Court station.

"I was the guard of that train," said Bill. "I had no feeling one way or the other about the ethics of the confounded strike, but I hate specialists; I fear and resent them, whether they are bankers or biologists or skilled tradesmen. So naturally I was on the side of the non-specialists; the public that is. I volunteered to be a porter, but when I ran into Jimmy Fell on Paddington station he appointed me his guard.

"Jimmy was a constructional engineer on leave from the wilds of Africa. He had been working with black labour a year or two longer than was good for him, and felt imperial; in fact he once left me behind in the Exeter station buffet, and I only caught my own train because they ran him into the engine sheds by mistake.

"He had driven all kinds of locomotives in his time, so the Great Western gave him a main line express and the *County of London* to pull it. He treated her as a pet car, and when he wasn't on the foot-plate he was wandering about inside her guts like Jonah with an oil-can. I call it an express, but all the signals were permanently at danger, and we used to feel our way down to Devon from block to block, stopping to argue with other amateur railwaymen whenever we found ourselves on a line where we had no right to be.

"After ten days or so of this, the Company chose us to take an excursion to Pangbourne. Yes, they actually wasted time on an excursion. It was a gesture, you see. Old Flugenheim always gave the sales ladies of Nelson, Gordon & Co. an outing in the same week of June; and Flugenheim, being both Nelson and Gordon and something in the City as well, was determined upon Business as Usual. The nation was paralysed, but he wouldn't disappoint his girlies, as he called them.

"Well, the Great Western were moved by this touching faith in their organization, so they agreed to the excursion. Britain you see, with her Back to the Wall. They cleared the line to Pangbourne, and at 9.30 a.m. we pulled out of Paddington with Jimmy Fell at the levers and five coach loads of chattering females between myself and him. Flugenheim and his managers naturally went by car; their lives were of value.

"We reached Pangbourne about midday—our average of 25 miles an hour was excellent considering that Jimmy had

climbed down twice to see which way the points were set, and had been hit by half a brick that was meant for the fireman. We never had the slightest trouble with the strikers—we were free entertainment for dull days—but the fireman thought he was entitled to call them names which would earn him half a brick at any time. He was a sort of fascist, or whatever they labelled themselves in those days, and all out to smash the reds. In private life he sold silk stockings from door to door, and he was hungry for any job that needed more muscle but just as little brain. He used to splash himself with oil and coal-dust to look like a real fireman. He didn't. You'd have taken him for a travelling prize-fighter who had been sleeping in a garage at night.

"The girlies trailed off to a tent by the river to hear Flugenheim's annual speech and eat some lunch. We could see the flags on the top of the marquee and hear the band playing a welcome. It was a blazing June day with thunder in the air, and when we had run the train into a siding the station was as peaceful as a country halt on a Sunday.

"We ourselves lunched at the local pub, and the bar had a few jokes at our expense—five coaches of women among three men and so forth. We didn't think them very funny jokes. There was something unnatural about those 250 females, mature but giggling. We had a sense of uneasiness, as if there had been a wagon-load of gelignite just behind the engine. Perfectly safe, of course—safe as a cartload of plasticine. A man used to explosives would think nothing of going to sleep with a stick of it in his pocket, though it could blow him into just as many pieces as a wagon-load. But there's room for confidence. Whereas quantity—well, one is appalled by sheer quantity.

"At three o'clock we went to work again. It was no job for amateurs to get the train from the down to the up line with the engine at the right end; but Jimmy was a positive chap with a commanding manner, ready to take responsibility when lesser men were doubtful. An invaluable quality in Africa, I expect. He ran the Holyhead boat train into a siding, blocked a down freight and borrowed its locomotive, and by using most of the main line between Pangbourne and Reading had hitched the *City of London* to the front of the train soon after four. The

girlies were lined up and doing a little community singing on the platform. They were sun-burned, tousled, perspiring and shrill.

While they climbed into the coaches, Flugenheim paced up the platform and made a little speech to Jimmy on his patriotism and what-not, shaking his hand with decent condescension. He mistook the fireman for the real thing and congratulated him on not being led away by subversive and anti-Christian agitators. He made his money, I believe, in the Far West where a strike's a strike; he couldn't be expected to know that English labour leaders are generally fervid chapel-goers.

"When this delicate ceremony was over and the doors were shut and Flugenheim and his managers lined up to wave good-bye till next year, the *County of London* whistled and drew out of the platform in smart main-line style. I just had time to wave the green flag and blow my own little whistle, but I doubt if anybody was taken in.

"Before we were fairly out of the station, Jimmy stopped with such a jerk that an empty oil-drum charged down the guard's van towards London by itself. I looked out of the window. A down train was creeping at us on the up line. We had forgotten one set of points after all our shunting, and the new arrival was proceeding with caution in search of authority.

"While Jimmy and his vis-à-vis straightened matters out, the girlies skipped back on to Pangbourne platform and began to dance. There was a lot of horseplay and shrieking, for they had the place to themselves. Flugenheim and his henchmen had left, and I was the only male in the station. I kept discreetly to my van. I don't know if you've noticed that young women by the mere fact of being in a group can reach a state of excitement that would take six whiskies on an empty stomach for the ordinary man.

"The intrusive train passed on its correct line, and Jimmy and the fireman returned to the locomotive. I shepherded the girlies back into their compartments and walked down the train shutting doors and turning handles. We were forbidden to start till all door handles were in the horizontal position. A strict rule. Even Jimmy observed it.

"When I was half way down the last coach I heard giggles.

turned round. The passengers had opened the doors again.

"Now then, young ladies!" I said.

"I thought my voice had just the right hearty note of tolerant authority—an amused policeman. They thought so, too. They thought I was perfect. One of the girls hollered:

"Ooh! Ain't 'e a duck!"

"I trotted back up the train with the proper brisk officiousness and shut the doors. They fell in with my absurd wishes. There was no question of a struggle with door-handles or direct disobedience; but just as soon as I was a dozen compartments up, the doors began to open behind me—one at a time, as neatly as a line of poppers bursting open from the bottom when you've nearly done them up to the top.

"I stood by the locomotive wondering what *A* did next. Hitherto my job had been easy. I had to manhandle the contents of the van, keep the way-bills, brake whenever I got an S.O.S. from the locomotive, and sometimes inspect tickets. With the ordinary mixed bag of passengers, points of discipline didn't arise. I had been accustomed to think myself as good a guard as the next; but now I was conscious of being a plain chap in flannel trousers and a sports coat.

"Jimmy said I had no character. He put his cap on the side of his head and walked down the platform. He was lean, brown and clean-shaven, a maiden's dream, born and fashioned for a uniform. But the overalls of an engine-driver were not, I think, the right uniform; he looked too much like a matinee idol in a stirring drama of life on the rolling rail.

"Ladies," he appealed, mounting a luggage barrow, "you've been given a nice day, and we have to go back to London. Now be sensible, and don't behave like babies!"

"A-oh, bybies!" protested a voice, half yearning, half insulted.

"Somebody else started a first-class imitation of a baby crying and they all joined in. You never heard such a row. Then they chose to regard Jimmy as the baby (for he was eminently motherable) and the more excitable spirits leaned out of the windows and made gestures of maternity at him. Jimmy turned white and strolled—yes, strolled—back to the locomotive. I think they must teach 'em a special walk for the casual entering

of cannibal villages. He started the train. They were all safely inside, and shut the doors themselves as soon as we gathered speed.

"At Reading the staff of the junction had forgotten our existence, and we were held up. But Jimmy didn't stop. He thundered slowly ahead at walking pace, and when there was doubt he reversed; he kept the *County of London* plunging back and forth as if he had been a dutiful gigolo guiding his grandmother through a crowded ballroom. The girlies stuck their heads out and yelled encouragement to us, but they didn't dare to step out on the platform.

"Once clear of Reading, we ran along with professional smoothness; there was no indiscipline except on the part of one young woman who tried to work her way along the footboard to the guard's van. I spotted her in time, and I didn't try any 'dear young lady' appeals on her. I opened fire with a paper-weight and told her that if she didn't get back into the train I should aim to hit next time. That worked. But my civil authority had gone. We obey a bus conductor or a guard or any honest fellow with some braid on his cap just as unthinkingly as sheep a dog. The moment his authority is tested it ceases to exist; it passes to the armed forces of the Crown—or to a paper-weight. The real trouble was that I hadn't even got a braided cap.

"At Maidenhead we stopped. There was nothing else for it; some damned fool was marshalling a milk train and had tied up the line. The girlies started cheering everything and everybody. They got down on the platform. There were no passengers about, only the usual skeleton staff of amateurs.

"By this time they had a ringleader. The excitement was still spontaneous, much too spontaneous, but its direction had been taken over by one Rhoda—a magnificent creature, loudly dressed, with the luxurious figure of a roly-poly angel sitting on a cloud, but the face, I tell you, of an ageless mule. Lord, how she must have despised men! Unaccountably cold and conceited she must have thought us.

"Led by Rhoda, the girlies cleaned up the station. They formed into bands, and played ring-ring-a-roses around every man on the platform until the whole lot had sheepishly taken

refuge in the ticket-office. They didn't run, you understand. They just drifted away on business, and found their business, as it might be accidentally, behind a door that could be locked. You know the feeling of being slowly followed through a field by a large herd of lowing cows. There's nothing to be afraid of. You don't run away. But you do climb the nearest fence rather than the farthest.

"Jimmy and the fireman took refuge in noise and fog, making the *County of London* spout steam from its nether parts. I can't tell you the mechanics of the process, but he caused it to throb and rejoice in its strength, pawing the lines and crying Ha Ha like the war-horse in Job. The girlies kept at a respectful distance.

"As for me, I climbed down to the track and watched through the intervals between the coaches. Whenever I caught a female eye, I started tapping at the wheels with a hammer. They left me alone. I suppose they felt that I knew what I was doing, and that it was necessary to their journey.

"Now up to this point it had all been clean fun. Men do after all arouse a certain pity in the female breast; they knew they had the upper hand and would have been quite content to treat us with good-humoured scorn if an official of their own sex hadn't interfered. She was the ticket-office clerk.

"I imagine she had been calling her male colleagues, who kept drifting into the office on improbable excuses, a bunch of incompetent cowards. At any rate she was a woman of character, and she was having no nonsense on her station. She marched out to deal with the mob, and began to round them up with all the efficiency of a Y.W.C.A. secretary. At that I began to tap my wheels more industriously than ever. When I thought it safe to look up again, Rhoda had crowned her with a fire-bucket, and she was quietly crying in a puddle of water. The girlies paid no further attention to her. They were bush-smashing the slot machines and eating chocolate.

"This was going too far. I shouted "All aboard!" waved my flag and blew a blast on the whistle. The line wasn't clear, but Jimmy caught on. He took the brakes off, and the *County of London* shattered the artificial fog with one colossal

whoosh of steam. In fact we put up a most convincing show of a train just about to leave.

"They were just piling into the compartments when Rhoda spoiled the picture.

"You stay there, mister!" she carolled. "We'll get in when we're bloody well ready:"

"That called our bluff, of course. We couldn't start without them—or rather it hadn't yet occurred to us that we could.

"It was then that the fireman lost his temper. His contempt for Jimmy and myself had been slowly rising. After all he had sold silk stockings through the suburbs, whereas Jimmy had only had to overawe a lot of savages. He got down from the footplate and walked along the platform, wiping his hands on a black yard of oily cotton-waste. A horrid weapon against best frocks in a rough and tumble. It gave him authority.

"Get on in, you silly bitches!" he roared.

"It wasn't courage; it was sheer lack of imagination. But his cave-man stuff damn near worked. His silk stockings had taught him a few of the more elementary facts about women. They were so startled that they began to get into the train.

"Come on, ma!" he ordered Rhoda, who was rather hesitantly standing her ground.

"She was only about nineteen, and that 'ma' infuriated her. It struck her right on the sorest spot in her soul. She snatched his oily rag and wiped his face with it.

"That was the detonator in the gelignite. They exploded. All the worry about fathers and brothers on strike, all the years spent behind counters controlling their natural instincts to be rude to people who were rude to them, all was released in one blast of females over that fireman. Before we could get up to the rescue they had dragged him into a compartment. They were yelling with rage. I suppose the only people who hear that sound are the officials of a woman's prison. There was no doubt that the fireman was for it if we couldn't pull him out.

"It was no good calling for police; there weren't any. We dived under the train and opened the door of the compartment that gave on to the tracks. The fireman's legs were sticking out from a tangled mass of femininity, and still waving feebly. We took a leg each and heaved, and he came out, leaving his

coat and shirt behind. On our rush to the engine his trousers dropped off him—not round his ankles, I mean, but vanished, disintegrated.

“ Jimmy opened up his steam screen to throw off the pursuit, and we started. This time there was no bluff to call. They knew we were running for our lives and didn’t care how many of them we left behind. They all got in, so far as I could see.

“ I wiped the worst of the blood and muck off the fireman and dressed him in Jimmy’s overalls. He had lost a good deal of skin and part of his scalp, but all his members were present and correct. He gibbered a bit, as was not unnatural, and kept grabbing at my knees.

“ Jimmy had the *County of London* pounding along at a steady forty. It was risky, but we were on the main line and we could see a mile ahead. We had it to ourselves. Those damned fellows at Maidenhead had held us up a good ten minutes longer than was necessary. All went well till we were just outside Ealing. There the *County of London* took a horrible lurch to starboard and nearly flung us off the footplate. By the time Jimmy had jammed on the brakes, we were careering through a goods yard surrounded by acres and acres of trucks.

“ ‘ I’m not stopping till we get to police,’ said Jimmy, setting his lips.

“ I agreed with him. Anything was better than loosing our five coaches of lunatics into a London unprotected.

“ We cut down to ten miles an hour, and at that speed we could hear the turmoil in the coach next to the engine. Somewhere they were singing songs, but most of them were sobbing and yelling. Whenever a door opened, I flung a lump of coal at it.

“ The line was clear. Lord knows for what mysterious traffic the points had been set ! Once we were in a cutting between houses where the rails were rusty with disuse, and once running alongside a maze of District lines, all of them electrified. The *County of London* was bouncing like a dinghy in a tide-rip. She squealed, rocking, round those switch-back curves. I could see that Jimmy was in agony, for he loved that locomotive and the driving of it ; but we looked at each other and at the fireman, and we kept going.

"We must have been dodging through the London suburbs for nearly a quarter of an hour when we staggered round the worst of all the curves and down an improbable gradient and saw a deserted station ahead of us.

"Royal Oak?" asked Jimmy, as if he had just sighted the coast of America in the wrong place.

"Must be!" I said.

"Of course it was absurd. When you're running into Paddington on a fast express, Ealing and Royal Oak go by in two flashes. But we hadn't the faintest notion where we were, and it never occurred to us that we had left the Great Western system altogether for outer space. We thought we had merely taken a very roundabout route to Royal Oak, and we blessed it; for Paddington and whole posses of police could only be two minutes away.

"Jimmy opened her out a little, and it was then that we saw a huge notice of EARLS COURT, and the arch over the east-bound line. As I say, we stopped a matter of three yards from it. We made one collective jump for the stairs, dragging the fireman between us, and got away before the terrors behind us realized what had happened.

"I heard that when the strike was over, they took the *County of London* apart, and lifted her out with a crane and a breakdown gang. The professional railwaymen said it was impossible to drive a 4-6-2 locomotive round those curves. I dare say it is; I swear the leading bogey jumped the track once, and then bounced back again. But what really horrified them was anarchy. I don't think it was coincidence that the strike ended two days later."

WAR WITHOUT END

BY LORD PONSONBY

ON the outbreak of war, Truth is the first casualty ; or as the Germans put it :

*Kommt der Krieg ins Land
Gibt Lügen wie Sand.*

So the ordinary citizen, although he may not believe all he is told, remains ignorant and mystified and falls back on the simple slogans which are offered to him and hears nothing of the similar slogans which are offered to those against whom he is fighting, but with whom he has no quarrel whatever. The downright falsehood circulated may not be as effective as concealed truth. No shred of justification for the enemy's attitude can be allowed. He must be painted all black in attacking unjustifiably those who are pure white. Obviously this is necessary in order to enflame public opinion sufficiently for purposes of recruiting and organization. To explain the truth, even tilting the balance of blame against the enemy, might encourage doubts and discussion. It must be remembered that this is done on both sides. Statements which may come through from the other side must be quickly branded as lies. Passions are roused and as time goes on atrocity stories keep them at boiling point. Of course there are atrocities in war time. But no war atrocity can equal the atrocity of war itself, determined on, as it is, in cold blood by chosen and respected governments. But the noticeable lack of enthusiasm this time shows that the people as yet have by no means been enflamed.

The middle-aged and old can remember the last war vividly enough and they can notice precisely the same routine being followed with a great many additional precautions on what is called "the Homefront". Germany is again the enemy with Hitler as the arch fiend instead of the Kaiser. They remember that the much heralded object of the war was to crush German

militarism and depose the Kaiser and so "make the world safe for democracy". It was "a war to end war". They were told then, as they are told now, that this could only be done by a "knock-out blow". Some of them rejoiced at the crushing victory and fully expected that all the desired objects would be achieved. To make this doubly sure a punitive treaty must be framed to keep Germany in subjection, carve out strategic frontiers to prevent her recovering her power, exact a fantastically exorbitant indemnity from her and reduce her armed strength to nothing more than a police force. In case there might be any hitch, the blockade was continued for six months after the Armistice so as to weaken by semi-starvation the coming race of Germans. Germany had to sign under duress and the Conference at Versailles broke up rejoicing at their success.

The words of President Wilson uttered during the war were set aside and forgotten. But they are worth quoting to-day.

It must be a peace without victory. Victory would mean peace forced upon the loser, a victor's terms imposed upon the vanquished. It would be accepted in humiliation under duress, at an intolerable sacrifice and would leave a sting, a resentment, a bitter memory upon which terms of peace would rest, not permanently but on a quicksand. Only a peace between equals can last.

So as time passed it happened that the victorious allies defended and enforced the terms of their Treaty, established an institution, the League of Nations, to maintain the *status quo* and watched the sufferings of the Germans without any qualms. Any suggestions on the part of the New Republican government were turned down although some of the preposterous absurdities connected with the indemnity had periodically to be mitigated. The elementary truth was realized that nations cannot thrive on the ruin of any nation. The economic prosperity of each depends on the prosperity of all nations.

There is no need to describe in detail how every one of the declared objects were falsified as the years passed. The Kaiser in course of time was replaced by Hitler. A German militarism grew up which became a far greater menace to European peace than the militarism which existed in 1914. In many countries democracy was threatened and parliaments fell and were replaced by Dictators. Instead of peace war was carried on

more or less incessantly in various parts of the world. Finally, the republican German Government was overthrown and ruthless and unscrupulous methods were used by a sensational dictatorship to restore to Germany all and more than all she had lost. Attempts were made to avoid a crisis but exasperation grew and, in despair, resort was had to threats and to force, the one method which could not finally solve the complex problems which had arisen.

So here we are again calling out for the overthrow of the present German Government, declaring again we are fighting in defence of "democracy" to which we add "civilization" owing to the diabolical nature of modern engines of war. We are to restore world peace and adjust the insoluble problems of the Central European States. The knock-out blow is described in phrases such as "Stop the Bully!" or "Hitlerism must be shattered for all time."

Many, indeed an ever increasing number, are asking whether the death of another million young British lives, the destruction of families in their own homes, the loss of irreplaceable buildings and treasures and the long lasting impoverishment of the nation is a fitting price to pay for a victory which yet again will be barren. The ideals may be high, their attainment this way is impossible.

No one wishes to defend Hitler, his policy, his method, his detestable persecutions or his selection of colleagues. Arguments enough can be found and declarations of his can be quoted to demonstrate his untrustworthiness. The Germans alone can deal with him and remove him. Every attempt to try and do so from outside may only strengthen his position. Dictators never last and never have successors. But it is our own countrymen we are thinking of and our native land when we declare that a prolonged carnage should at all costs be avoided and it is humanity itself we have in view when we protest against such an outrage.

But it will be said that death is better than dishonour. We were bound by a pledge to defend Poland. This pledge was given it appears before consultation with the high military command. Mr. Lloyd George wrote :

The Chief of our General Staff was abroad in France when this hare-brained pledge was given. I have good reason to believe that on his return he and his advisers pointed out that we did not possess the means to redeem it.

Not only the high command but any junior subaltern knew that the defence of Poland by us was impossible. Now that Poland has been conquered and devastated, the valiant resistance of the people having been stimulated by the prospect they were encouraged to expect of our help, we have shifted our war aim to the restoration of an independent Polish State. But, of course, it was not Poland primarily we were thinking of. After all from the last partition of Poland in 1795 up to 1918 a period of 123 years, we accepted, not the reduction of Polish territory but the complete extinction of Poland as an independent State. No, Poland was simply the last straw in Hitler's series of advances in the process of tearing up article by article the Treaty of Versailles.

Austria, although protected by the League of Nations, had been swallowed up. Czechoslovakia was the next prey. In this case the effective defence of this newly created state was admitted to be impossible. In his speech at Birmingham on March 17th, the Prime Minister said :

Really I have no need to defend my visits to Germany last autumn for what was the alternative ? Nothing that we could have done, that France could have done, or Russia could have done could possibly have saved Czechoslovakia from invasion and destruction. Even if we had subsequently gone to war to punish Germany for her actions, and if after frightful losses which would have been inflicted upon all partakers in the war we had been victorious in the end, never could we have reconstructed Czechoslovakia as she was framed by the Treaty of Versailles.

This was absolutely true. Substitute "Poland" for "Czechoslovakia" in the above passage and it is true again.

But after the failure of Munich, the Prime Minister changed his policy. The failure on one occasion of a policy is no adequate reason for its abandonment. In framing any policy account should always be taken not only of its probable or possible success but of what will happen if it fails. The Munich policy of consultation and discussion may have been doubtful considering the character and reputation of the negotiations on the German side and its failure may have been a diplomatic defeat. Yet there was nothing on our side which we need be ashamed of. But at any rate it saved Czechoslovakia from the devastations

to which Poland has been subjected not to mention the serious loss of lives. But the government had meanwhile changed its policy. Driven by the more bellicose section of opinion, Mr. Chamberlain speeded up rearmament and accepted the idea that threats from Britain and France would be enough to prevent Hitler from proceeding further. This proved to be his first mistake. Sir Edward Grey's warning, in his reflections on the last war, that the chief cause of it was the competition in armaments which preceded it and that such a competition again would inevitably lead to another war, was disregarded. Then followed a series of inept diplomatic blunders. The adherence of Russia to the cause of Britain and France in spite of long drawn out negotiations never came to an agreement. It would have required no great astuteness to realize that a simple alliance with the Western powers would not suit Russia's book. With their proverbial astuteness they were surveying the whole scene and having heard the point of view even of a military mission from England, the U.S.S.R. ostensibly joined the German side. Although this appeared to be a diplomatic defeat for us, it is by no means certain that Russia may not be more embarrassing as an ally than formidable as an opponent.

But the Government's worst mistake was the entanglement produced by the pledges of protection given to States in Eastern Europe, notably Poland. The pledges gave them no security as has been already proved; they are a source of embarrassment to us and give the warmongers an opportunity for raising the fatuous cry of 'British Honour' with the prospect of an interminable war. Is there no statesman among our governors who understands that the question of the frontiers and ownership of the different nationalities, races and civilization in Central Europe is positively incapable of final solution. The number of times there have been frontier changes in this part of Europe during past centuries cannot be counted. The make-shift of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, whatever may be said against it, was infinitely preferable to the settlement reached at Versailles in 1919, which only sowed the seeds of certain conflict. The idea of supposing that we and our allies after a great victory are going to carve out this territory in such a way as to satisfy the nationalities which are not compact but scattered and at the

same time also to meet with the approval of their powerful neighbours, is futile beyond belief.

But very special consideration ought to be given to the long established, highly civilized and progressive neutral states near to us in Western Europe. Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden, whose sole desire is peace, must inevitably suffer in any conflict between the Great Powers. Even if their territory is not actually invaded the economic loss they are bound to suffer may be very serious, yet they are in no way participants nor are they involved in the constantly recurring disputes of their powerful neighbours. As to our one sure ally the possible loss of life and destruction if French soil again becomes the battlefield, are likely to be far greater than our own.

When, therefore, it is argued, we cannot come to terms with Hitler; we cannot trust the word of the Nazi government, consequently we must go on till that government is overthrown, we must consider first of all whether such a complete military victory and a change of Government in Germany will lead for certain to a peace which, to be lasting, must be based on general consent. With 1919 in mind no one can venture to assert that it would. We must then count the inevitable cost of the endeavour to accomplish this highly questionable and uncertain aim.

A prolonged war possibly against both Germany and Russia must involve :

Casualties amounting to several millions of the youth of each nation—their most valuable possession.

Casualties beyond reckoning of men, women and children in their own homes.

Starvation by blockade of children of the coming generation.

Destruction of buildings and treasures of irreplaceable value.

Debt and bankruptcy and the dissipation of all funds for the building up of the nation's economic and cultural life.

The spread of the poison of hatred and violence, the lowering of the moral standard and the degradation of social and political life for years to come.

Just before this article was written, Hitler delivered his Reichstag speech. Detaching his boasting and bombast, those who advise peremptory and wholesale rejection of all the suggestions made can find justification and will receive support from the advocates of the "knock-out blow". The tentative

proposals in the second part of his speech can be interpreted as an admission of the grave apprehensions he feels for Germany's fate if war continues. The course of wisdom would seem to be to ignore the *Führer's* language, rhetoric and bluster and by careful and calm argument to open the door to diplomatic discussion. Difficult as this may be considering the record and temperament of the Dictator, it must never be forgotten that a crushing and even rapid military victory for the Allies (which hardly seems likely if Russia has to be fought as well) cannot possibly secure a real and durable peace ; and moreover is bound to lead yet again to devastating armed conflict in not many years to come.

The war weapon is supposed by victory to make a sharp, decisive and conclusive cut. In these days it can do nothing of the sort. It is a cruel but blunt weapon that strikes with equal force the hand that wields it and inflicts on all festering wounds which may never heal.

THE ECONOMICS OF THE FAMILY

BY ELEANOR F. RATHBONE, M.P.

IT is a mistake to think of Family Allowances as merely a device for preventing absolute poverty, in the sense of the insufficiency of the family income to provide the basic necessities of physical life. That is one aspect of the problem and probably the most urgent. Poverty of that kind is more widespread than is generally supposed. But it is only one aspect of the maladjustment between incomes and reasonable needs, which arises from the lack in our economic system of any provision for directly meeting the normal but temporary incidence of child dependency. This lack produces results which affect not only the happiness and welfare of individual families in every class except the really wealthy, but also society as a whole—results which crop up as factors in problems apparently quite diverse. For example, there are the problems of the quantity and quality of the population and consequently the nation's capacity for self-defence and the future of the British Empire; the distribution of the nation's expenditure as between necessities and luxuries; the relative costs of production in industries employing chiefly adult male labour and of those employing chiefly female and juvenile labour; the relation between men's and women's wages; the relation between rates of benefit and public assistance which take account of family dependency and wages which take no such account; the distribution of housing subsidies; the status of motherhood and maternal mortality. Interest in one or other of these very different problems has led experts in economics, sociology and hygiene, feminists, finally even politicians, to recognize this particular lack in our social system and to consider family allowances as a remedy for it; just as people travel to a market town to satisfy their varying needs from smaller towns, hamlets and farms, by high-roads and by-paths all converging on one

common centre. The wonder is that the subject has not aroused general interest long ago.

For consider, merely as a matter of numbers, the extent of the defect. Even now, in this period of small families, dependent wives and children constitute nearly half the population. They outnumber employers, employed persons and self-employed, all put together. The Census of 1931 for England and Wales showed a population of roughly 40 millions, of whom about $16\frac{3}{4}$ millions were actually "occupied" persons; over 10 millions were normally occupied but unemployed. Of those described as "unoccupied", about $17\frac{1}{2}$ million were wives or children under 20.

This large army of $17\frac{1}{2}$ million has no spending power directly behind it. Except for the provision of education and certain other social services, society provides no channel by which any portion of the community's wealth reaches this half of its members. They are expected to be kept by the male head of the family out of earnings which make no distinction between those with or without dependents.

Yet the importance of this section of the community is not merely numerical. Its members are not really unoccupied except in the Census sense of unremunerated. The children and young persons are preparing for their future as citizens and workers. At least five-sixths of the mothers keep no servants, observe no working hours, are engaged from morning to night on tasks essential to the welfare of their families and their homes. When any of them bears a child, she does it at a risk to life greater than that of a miner who pursues his notoriously dangerous occupation for a whole year.

It seems platitudinous to insist that children have a value to the State none the less real because its realization lies in the future and that the production and rearing of them is a service financially onerous to the father and laborious to the mother. To deny this merely because some children turn out to be useless citizens is as silly as it would be to deny that manual labour generally speaking has a value for the State on the ground that some manual labourers produce commodities which prove unsaleable or noxious.

Yet neither the quality nor the quantity of this section of the

community—the children and their mothers—receives any recognition in the economic system, which provides reserves for the renewal of material capital but not of human capital. Hence the various anomalies of a wage and salary system which is expected to fulfil the double function of directly remunerating the individual labourer and indirectly providing for the recruitment of future generations without distinction between those who are or are not actually contributing to the latter service.

Here in its broadest aspect is the problem we have to discuss. Is this feature of the economic system just and does it work out well? Some advocates and most opponents of family allowances are interested not at all in the justice side of the problem, but only in the expediency side. Their attention has been directed to one or more of the many disadvantages arising from the present system and they are concerned only to prove or disprove the utility of family allowances as a means of meeting that particular difficulty. But those who take a wide view see the problem as though a number of people were seated round a table engaged in sharing among themselves the nation's wealth. There are represented the public authorities, the landowners, capitalists, employers, employed and people paid by the job. The representative of each group and grade within it puts forward its claims to the share he thinks its due. Then from behind them all steps forth a new claimant—the Family—and says, "Here, what about me? Haven't I a right to a share? Without me where would you all be? You wouldn't exist. The numbers and the quality of your successors depends on me. Whether you can defend your liberties, people your colonies, supply your markets depends on how I do my job. But you ask me to build A.I. men—and enough of them—out of the scraps that fall from your tables. What if I go on strike? Give me my share."

The usual reaction to that voice has hitherto been to ignore it; not so much to feign deafness as subconsciously to block the ears. Those who feel impelled to reply never do so by disparaging the Family, but by sentimentalizing it. Husbands are reminded in effect that "to make a home for weans and wife is the true pathos and sublime of human life"; that the joys of parenthood should be their own reward, and are not only

ys but responsibilities freely assumed and to be freely discharged, that to subsidize parenthood would be an insult to the right kind of parent and an encouragement to irresponsible breeding in the wrong ; also an injustice to those who for perhaps good reasons have abstained from the pleasures of family life yet would be required to contribute towards the indulgence of others.

These arguments betray lazy thinking. In no other form of service is the fact that it is undertaken for motives other than gain made a reason for demanding that those who practise it should be not only unremunerated, but should provide all the materials for their task, out of income derived from some quite different form of service. It is as though a doctor were required to give not only his services free but also the medicines and diet he prescribes.

As for encouraging irresponsible parenthood, it is the present system which does that. It has resulted in rigid birth control by just those parents, in every class, who have relatively high standards for their children, while it has thrust millions of others into conditions of poverty and overcrowding which leave them with none but sensual pleasures and so induce intemperance and reckless breeding. At present the filtering downward of knowledge of contraception is changing the problem of a differential birthrate into one of an absolute deficiency in fertility, which threatens race suicide. According to Dr. Carr-Saunders, one of the principal experts on population, " we are not only not replacing ourselves, but are between 25% and 30% below replacement rate ". We have already the lowest birthrate in Europe except Sweden and nearly the lowest in the civilized world. We have to consider whether it is safe for ourselves, or good for the world, that the proportion of the white races to the coloured and of the Anglo-Saxon race to all the others should be a steadily diminishing proportion.

The problem therefore is one both of justice and of expediency. It may be well to summarize here some of the main results of the lack in our economic system of direct provision for child maintenance.

First, this lack is the main permanent cause of primary poverty. Sir John Orr's investigations showed that 10 per cent.

of the population were living on incomes of 10/- or less weekly and were spending an average of 4/- weekly on food. But the proportion of children living on these low incomes is far higher than that of the general population. About 25 per cent. of the child population is estimated to be so living. Yet we have heard much, lately, of the difficulty of keeping evacuated children on 8/6 per week !

Secondly, the present system encourages expenditure on luxuries rather than necessities. This is so even in the poorest class. Young men brought up in poverty become relatively affluent when they first enjoy a man's wages. They form habits of expenditure on drink, tobacco, cinemas, betting, which are hard to break when they marry and have to keep a wife and children out of their wages. This impetus to the luxury trades has a special significance in war time. The principal necessities for a family are house-room, bread, meat, milk, butter, vegetables, clothing, coal, light. If we are producing less of these things than is needed for national safety, it is largely because the potential purchasers, the mothers, have had insufficient purchasing power.

Thirdly, the maladjustment between wages and provision for the unemployed is due to the fact that the latter provision includes, as wages do not, allowances for wives and children. Even so, the present scales of statutory benefit and unemployment assistance are insufficient, where there are several children, to cover bare physical needs as computed on any recognized scientific standard. Yet to increase those scales would mean enlarging the already considerable proportion of the unemployed who are as well off out of work as in it and have therefore little inducement to seek work energetically. "If," says the Statutory Committee, "the wage system made allowance for dependency, the main objection to further increase in rates of benefit would be removed."

Fourthly, so long as men's wages have to fulfil the double function of rewarding the individual labourer and providing for the recruitment of future generations, the problem of competition at once free and fair between male and female adult workers seems insoluble. There is a strong sentiment for keeping the best paid and most skilled occupations for men

in the presumption that they "have families to keep". This hinders the full utilization of women's capacities. Further, the system throws an unfair burden upon the heavy industries which employ chiefly males and are in effect providing the future workers for the lighter industries and the distributive trades.

Fifthly, the system tends to depress the status of married women and mothers. It encourages self-indulgent or tyrannical husbands to regard their wages as something to which they have an indisputable right, even when pushing their claim to higher wages on the ground of the needs of "our wives and families."

Cash allowances for dependent children would meet all these defects in our social system. Extended provision of school meals, milk, etc.—the method preferred by some—should be regarded as supplementary rather than as an alternative. Such provision cannot meet the needs of children below school age and when extended to cover holiday periods is an expensive form of provision.

How could a system of Family Allowances be introduced and how should it be financed? So far, apart from the separation allowances paid in the armed Services, experiments in this country have been few. The Wesleyan Church for over a century and several Anglican dioceses recently have paid allowances for the children of their ministers and clergy. The London School of Economics pays allowances to its staff on the generous scale of £30 per annum for each child up to 13 and £60 up to the end of university education. Within the last year or so, at least twenty large manufacturing firms have introduced the system for their employees. In most of these the payment is subject to an income limit and commences with the third child.*

But however useful as an experiment, these individual schemes, if widely extended, are certain to come up against the difficulty which wrecked the system in Germany during the post-war years, that they risk discrimination against the married man. There are three methods of universalizing the system which avoid this difficulty.

The first method is that of Equalization Funds or Pools. Each employer co-operating in the scheme, which may be

*Particulars of these schemes can be obtained from the Family Endowment Society, 72, Horseferry Road, London, S.W.1.

either on an industrial or a regional basis, pays into the Pool his quota of the cost estimated according to the number of his employees, whether married or single, or alternatively according to the total of his wage-bill; and out of the Pool the allowances are paid on the agreed scale. This method is of French origin. Introduced in 1919 on a voluntary basis, it spread rapidly and proved so successful that in 1932 it was made compulsory and provision was made for its progressive extension to all employers in industry, commerce and agriculture. In Belgium a similar system has had an almost exactly parallel development. In both countries Trade Union opinion, at first suspicious or hostile, became increasingly favourable and the system is now universally accepted as part of the economic structure. The Pool method has the advantage that it combines universality with great adaptability to the varying conditions in different occupations or localities. Its disadvantages are that it throws the cost entirely upon the back of industry; that it is inapplicable to those who are self-employed or paid by the job; and that it is resolutely opposed by British Trade Union opinion, as tending to give the control mainly to the employing class.

The second possible method is through an extension of compulsory contributory insurance, on similar lines to unemployment and health insurance. This plan is discussed by Mr. J. L. Cohen in his book on "Family Income Insurance." He estimated that in 1926 equal contributions from the State, the workers and the employers of 1/4 in respect of each adult workman and of 8d. in respect of each woman or juvenile worker would yield an allowance of 5/- weekly per child under 15. The cost would be substantially lower now owing to the fallen birth rate. This method again fails to provide for any but employed persons. But it has the merit of familiarity, of using existing administrative machinery, and of sharing the cost between the three parties chiefly interested in child recruitment.

A third alternative is that of a wholly State-paid system. A Joint Committee of the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party, after a very thorough examination of the whole subject in 1929, recommended such a system by a majority of 8 to 4. On the statistical data available the cost of State-paid schemes can be only roughly estimated. A Report issued by P.E.P.

reckoned that in 1936 the cost of an allowance of 5/- weekly for every working-class child in the United Kingdom would have then been about £113 million. I am permitted to quote calculation—made privately and in no way official—by Mr. J. Lafitte, of P.E.P., that to begin with the second child in the family would reduce the cost to £58 $\frac{3}{4}$ million, with the third child to £23 $\frac{1}{2}$ million, with the fourth child to £10 $\frac{1}{2}$ million. Resultant economies in public assistance, in unemployment assistance, and in the cost of medical aid to victims of malnutrition have also to be taken into account.

A further possibility is to combine either a contributory insurance scheme or a State-paid scheme with voluntary schemes on the Pool method, applied to sections of society which are either left out of or insufficiently provided for under the general scheme. If part of the aim is to remove the economic obstacle to parenthood, it is futile to ignore differences in standards of living. Teachers, ministers of religion and doctors are presumably not especially self-indulgent or un-child-loving people. Yet the fall in fertility has been steepest in just those professions. Whatever methods are adopted, the following considerations should be borne in mind.

First, the allowance should be adequate, if it is to have the desired effect either upon fertility or upon health and contentment. If the widely extended French system has done too little—and it has done something—to check the falling birth rate, it is because the scales at their highest met only part and usually a small part of the minimum cost of child maintenance.

Secondly, the allowances should start at least with the second child. To assume that men's wage rates should be sufficient at the lowest to meet the needs of man, wife and three children is to ask industry to make provision not only for about eight million real children belonging to families of wage-earning grades but also for some eighteen million non-existent children. Neither here, nor in the U.S.A., nor in Australia, has this desired objective of Trade Unionism been reached, and for all three it is estimated that if reached it would absorb so much of the product of industry that little would be left for salary and wage payments above the minimum.

Thirdly, payment should be to the mother rather than to

the wage-earner, because this emphasises the distinction between wages and allowances and so avoids arousing the jealousy of childless workers. This is borne out by the experience of France and New South Wales.

Fourthly, the best moment for introducing a general system would be when the wage movement is upward, not downward, so that the allowance comes as an alternative to a small flat rate wage-increase rather than as a solace for a wage-cut. In the latter case, it tends to be regarded as a cause of the cut. This observation again is a fruit of French experience. Such a movement is likely to come soon as a result of war conditions.

Fifthly, while no general system could be introduced without the consent of the workers' organizations, the somewhat suspicious attitude of these towards the proposal should not be taken too seriously. When dependants' allowances were first introduced into Unemployment Insurance, many anticipated that the unmarried workers would resent paying contributions calculated to provide allowances for "other men's wives and children". This fear proved groundless. Though only a minority of workers are at any one time responsible for the maintenance of children, the great majority are in this condition during the best years of their maturity. British workers are not less likely than those of France to appreciate the value of the system to themselves as well as to Society, if first won over by judicious propaganda and experiment.

JUSTICE SHALL PREVAIL

BY HENRY BAERLEIN

ONE of our objects being the restoration of the independence of the democratic State of Czechoslovakia, it will be useful to learn how the Czechs themselves, in their own country and outside it, are facing the future. A great many able-bodied Czechs and Slovaks who are happily, or will be, outside the Protectorate, will be taking up arms as they did in the previous war, when the legionaries in Russia and Siberia (to say nothing of those who fought with the French and Italian armies) covered themselves with glory. The news of the formation of the Czechoslovak army on French soil has worried the Germans to such an extent that the so-called Prague Government has been compelled to issue warnings that it is unreasonable to join such a force and that prisoners captured from it will face the death penalty. When the time comes for the legions to go to the front they will treasure the words which Masaryk addressed to their predecessors on the eve of the battle of Zborov in Russia :

Remember that the whole enslaved nation turn their eyes upon you who are free to act, with hope and faith, expecting you to bring them liberation. We are proud in the knowledge that the descendants of the Hussites, having fought in the name of liberty, justice and self-determination, have observed and are executing their duty towards the nation, democracy and humanity.

What is going on in the Protectorate ? You will have heard of outbreaks that have taken place in various parts and it may have been imagined that they would be able to shake off the German yoke. In this article I propose to give the simple facts, avoiding exaggeration and what is known as wishful thinking.

With regard to public property, the land belonging to the State, hitherto administered by the Czechoslovak Directorate

The title of this article, President Masaryk's motto, became the motto of the Republic.

of State Forests and Estates, had to be handed over to the Germans after July 20th on the basis of an 'agreement' concluded between the former Directorate and the Land Section of the Ministry of Agriculture. This was preceded by the arrest and imprisonment of the Director General of State Forests and Estates, Dr. Siman, and his deputy, as well as a number of members of the Land Section of the Ministry of Agriculture. The methods in use are best illustrated by the following case : in Benesov, a town in a purely Czech district within the boundaries of which is situated the well-known castle of Konopiste with all the forests and lands belonging to it, the judge refused to enter the transfer in the land registry, on the ground that the legal basis prescribed by the Civil Code did not exist. He was warned that he would be arrested if the registration were not carried out within four hours and ultimately he had to comply. In this manner the Germans seized a vast property belonging to the Czech nation.

With regard to private property, the sale or leasing of property beyond a few acres is subject to the approval of the German authorities. Experience has shown that only such contracts obtain approval where the persons concerned are of German race and Nazis. For example, Count X...*, the owner of a large estate in Moravia is an old man, so that he entrusted the administration to a younger Czech aristocrat who, like himself, was a member of the Czech National Union. Both gentlemen were ordered to enlist in the Nazi party and when they refused they were set aside, while all the Czech employees were dismissed, their places being taken by Germans from the Reich.

The Dresden Bank, closely connected with the present *régime*, compelled the chief Czech bank, the Zivnostenská Banka, to sell the majority of its shares in the Escompte Bank whose existence had been prolonged by the strong financial support of the Zivnostenská ; the Escompte was then turned into an instrument of penetration in Bohemia and Moravia. For this purpose it had to be provided with capital, which was ruthlessly brought about. Czech currency circulating in Sudete territory included 1½ milliard crowns of State notes ; the Government

*His name, which I have given to the Editor, is for obvious reasons suppressed.—H.B.

forced immediate payment of the State-notes debt, thus creating the most primitive form of inflation, without shouldering even the negligible burden of ordinary inflationary operations—the printing of paper money. The effects upon Czech currency and upon the level of prices, and the pauperization of Czech capital, comprising mainly the savings of the lower and middle classes, are easily imaginable. The same methods have been brought to bear in every direction, for instance the Witkowitz Iron Works employing 40,000 hands and valued at 10 million sterling, were bought by the Germans for 1½ million pounds; needless to say the Czech directors were arrested and discharged from the service of the company.

The Escompte Bank has been entrusted with the highway-robbery transactions whereby any Jewish banker, financier or merchant before going abroad has had to deliver to the tender mercy of the bank his entire property. 'I give you the right of priority' so runs the precious document, 'in the purchasing of all my property. You are entitled to alienate a part or the whole of it'. In the overwhelming majority of cases it has been acquired for a song by German Nazi leaders. When the Jewish proprietor could not decide to go abroad the will to sell out under similar conditions has been helped by arrests and imprisonment. Considerations of space prevent me from entering more fully into the measures by which the ruin of the Czechs is being effected, for example, a special department exists for the permission to import raw materials from abroad, permission which German firms obtain and which is all too often withheld from a Czech firm.

Of course, when Dr. Nebesky, the chairman of the National Unity Party, signed a declaration of loyalty to the Germans in the hope of saving the lives of 160 Czechs in whose houses the Gestapo had discovered arms, this declaration was estimated at its true value by the rest of the world. It talks of a prosperous future under German protection, but the Czechs are bitterly aware of the price they are paying for this future 'happiness'. To take a single instance, the price of potatoes has gone up four hundred per cent. The Government has demanded that Prague should express its loyalty to the Reich by floating a large war loan to be paid mainly in goods. Prague is said to

have taken refuge behind the great economic difficulties which the Protectorate is experiencing as a result of German requisitioning and, according to the latest reports, has refused.

Following Himmler's refusal to accept responsibility for order, the onus of keeping the Czechs quiet has been thrust on the military authorities, a task which it is estimated demands the presence of 250,000 to 300,000 men who would otherwise be at the front. The fear of a Czech rising is so strong that the German deputy Mayor of Prague, Dr. Pfitzner, was ordered on August 15th to provide accommodation for 5,000 tanks and ammunition lorries. The Germans do not seem very confident of their tenure of Bohemia and Moravia. Many German-owned buildings in Prague and other towns have recently been offered for sale, mainly to Czech banks. The Gestapo headquarters at Prague are in the former Cadets' college. Trenches have hastily been dug in the grounds and a generous supply of barbed-wire fences been provided. Special motor-buses have left for Germany with the families of the police—the Schupo—who had been drafted into the Protectorate. Many of these families had only just arrived.

When the war began wholesale arrests were carried out in Prague and throughout the country. It would almost be simpler to give a list of those who have not yet been arrested. Members of the Executive Committee chosen by the Germans themselves, the Lord Mayor of Prague, the eighty-year-old Abbot Zavoral, Monsignor Stasek, head of the Catholic Party, and about 5,000 others were imprisoned on September 1st. Tenants of apartments overlooking the prison courtyard at Pankrác, near Prague, have been forbidden to look out of their windows and drastic also are the penalties if they admit to their dwellings any friends or relatives of the prisoners. Nevertheless people have been recognized in the yard. Machine-guns have been mounted on many roofs in Prague, Pilsen and elsewhere. These, it was given out, are anti-aircraft weapons; but it has since become apparent that they are ordinary machine-guns to be used in case of rioting.

German ruthlessness has had an effect contrary to the expectations of those directing it. Slovak soldiers refused in thousands to obey orders and have been disarmed; great

umbers crossed into Poland and Hungary. The highly skilled workers at the Skoda establishment and at the Brno Small Arms Factory have declined to turn out weapons for the Nazis. Moreover the Czechs and Slovaks who are organizing from within the attack against the hated Nazi *régime* have been joined by democratic Germans. More than half the Czechs in the world live abroad and all are working in the service of the Republic that will be re-constituted, aiding their compatriots in the rapid organization of sabotage. Funds are being supplied chiefly by the American Czechs, as during the World War. From their mother-country they receive reliable reports in spite of the strict censorship. Between Paris and Prague there is a regular 'underground' system of couriers by means of whom money is sent into the country and information brought out. The secret organization distributes pamphlets encouraging the Czechs to remain loyal to their tradition and to trust Benesh. Illegal printing-presses abound and continue to work. When the Nazis gave the names of Hitler and Horst Wessel to Masaryk and other streets the 'underground' workers painted out the new names overnight and restored the old ones. The whispering campaign is almost as effective as wireless messages; after one person has listened in to London or Paris the news circulates with amazing thoroughness.

There has just appeared an interesting book, 'Czechs and Germans'*, in which the author, Philip Paneth, gives an admirable account—particularly in the second part—of what the Czechs are now enduring. As they are a singularly dour people we can well understand that their resistance to the Nazis has been intensified. Here we have only space for a few passages from Mr. Paneth's book. The Landed Property Office of the Czech Government now contains sixty German officials, the Czech officials previously in charge having been imprisoned and treated with a brutality that must be revolting to any normal person. They were not even allowed to change their blood-stained linen after ill-treatment. Similar humanitarian standards have been introduced at Kladno where 'as a sequel to the murder of a German policeman by another German, there have been wholesale arrests of Czech citizens, among them

*Nicholson & Watson. 8s. 6d.

M. Pavel, the mayor, who was beaten to death by the Gestapo and then thrown into the castle moat, to give the impression that he had committed suicide. His body, however, revealed the fact that he died of a ruptured kidney for which the Gestapo was obviously responsible. The wife of the deputy mayor has received from the concentration camp in Dachau an urn containing her husband's ashes. Of the many citizens of Kladon who were arrested 800 are still in prison, including Dr. Niederle, who reported the true cause of the death of the German policeman and refused to change his report to suit the wishes of the authorities.' By the way, a new concentration camp has been opened at Schlackenwert near Karlsbad, where the prisoners include a large number of disillusioned Sudete Germans who have too publicly expressed their regret at having voted for Henlein and Hitler.

Baron Neurath, head of the Protectorate, recently threatened that he would adopt the severest measures if the Czech Press did not mend its ways and loyally publish what was supplied to it. The famous daily, the *Narodni Listy*, had ventured to suggest that people in Prague should not be forced to speak German; for this grave offence it was suspended for ten days and fined a million crowns, which was afterwards reduced to the modest sum of 330,000 crowns on the understanding that if the paper gives the least sign of being anti-German in future the whole sum will have to be paid.

The censorship has now been extended to the official weather reports. Not long ago it happened that the meteorological office in Prague published the following forecast: 'Cold and rainy weather will continue for a time, but fine weather is approaching. Cloudy in Germany, with the likelihood of disturbances.' The German authorities would not allow this report to appear, although the office which issues the bulletin protested that it was merely a weather forecast.

EBB AND FLOW

BY STEPHEN GWYNN

WE are now going to see what Hitler has really meant to the German people. If his rule continues to be supported by them, even for a year, under the existing conditions, he must have created an enthusiasm for himself, which could not exist without a sense of gratitude. **The German People** It is agreed that he has imposed heavy and continuing sacrifices; but perhaps they have felt themselves paid in pride. The enslavement of Czechoslovakia and the swift overthrow of Poland may have given to the whole nation a jubilant sense of power. That may seem an adequate return for the acceptance of narrow rations, and for the loss of very many lives; logic does not enter into these matters, and so long as the series of triumphs continues unbroken, Germany may feel for Hitler what France, even when bled white, continued to feel for Napoleon.

But the testing time has only just begun. War in the West is not yet impressive; though those who can remember back for five-and-twenty years will realize that this time it is being fought on German soil. In the East, victory has been decisive, but if the labour and the military credit go to Germany, the booty is divided with a claimant who scarcely needed to fire a shot. Germany has recovered the "Corridor", and much more so boot, but at the price of establishing along her eastern frontier the contact of a creeping and insidious contagion. The Poles, we are told, hated and feared Russia much worse than Germany, and naturally, for Poland, though a democracy, was organized about a framework of aristocracy. Soviet troops were hardly across the border before Polish peasants were encouraged to cut the throats of their landlords and to seize their lands. Germany as the price of victory takes over the government of some fifteen million Poles—one widespread nucleus of trouble; but

close at hand, across a barrier which can never be made germ-proof, will be a state in which the under-dog has definitely been put on top. East Prussia itself will be in no way immune from this infection.

* * * * *

Add to this the effect of disclosures which cannot be kept from spreading through the people. Mr. Knickerbocker, the **Mr. Knicker-** American journalist, has, perhaps, dealt the most **bocker's** dangerous blow to Nazi authority which it has **Disclosures** yet received. How far it can be established that Hitler's chief counsellors have possessed themselves of large fortunes, and lodged their fortunes outside Germany, who can say? But unless it can be disproved most conclusively, the rumour will spread like a plague, and among people on whom great privations are imposed, its action must be formidable. It may be that Hitler has so far won the confidence of his people that nothing will be believed even for an instant against the men he trusts; if so, his achievement is great, and some of the credit should go to these associates of his. But from what one knows of human nature, it is hard to credit that such charges will not be listened to, or that, if listened to, they can fail to shake allegiance to its roots.

Add again the fact that Russia is not longer merely on the Polish frontier; the whole line of Baltic States from Lithuania to Estonia is now passing virtually under her control; and manifestly Germany's domination of the Baltic begins to be challenged—a singularly unforeseen result of the Polish adventure, and one which Russia has attained, after Hitler's own fashion, without firing a gun. These are considerations which may not weigh at first with a populace, impressed with the triumph of conquering within thirty days a warlike people of over thirty millions; but they will begin to weigh when the price of that victory is seen to be a new war against the whole strength of England and of France. They must weigh already with the permanent organization of the German army which is the central armature about which the whole life of modern Germany is built up. Here indeed is the one element in the nation which seems capable of independent and reasoning volition. It is said that the army was against risking the

occupation of the Rhineland ; it is said that it was against being the issue in Munich : if so, the success (from the army's standpoint) of both moves gave the *Führer* an overwhelming authority when—with or without the army's approval—he forced this issue also in Poland, counting, as it would seem, on a swift attainment of the *fait accompli*—in which he was not wrong ; but counting also on a fresh acceptance of it by the western powers, in which his judgment was not so happy. Certainly also Russia's intervention and its consequences, if they went according to plan, did not go according to any plan Hitler's.

* * * * *

It is then possible that the military element in Germany may decide that Hitler and his adherents are too dangerous a government for Germany to entertain. Even if from the army's point of view he has been worth much to the nation, it may not seem worth

Hitler and the Army

fighting a long war to keep him—and his satellites ; especially in military judgment, the chances of ultimate victory are very doubtful. Lord French of Ypres, when he was in Ireland, and after the first allied successes that he thought the war would last another year. But there was one chance of an earlier end ; German discipline was the most wonderful that the world had seen, yet it had one limitation ; it postulated success. Troops like ours, he said, which had in comparison no training, may be thrown back without any considerable effect on their morale : the Germans expect that an operation undertaken will be carried through. The one thing that might end the war would be, he said, “ a strike of the German army.” And in fact the German *moral* collapsed ; yet, so far as I have been able to ascertain, it was not in the army that the breakdown came, but in the navy, too long kept in port, and in the civilian population. From them it spread at last even to the troops. But it spread.

It is possible that the German High Command, knowing what Lord French knew, and lacking confidence of success, may decide for what may seem to them the lesser of two evils. A military revolution in Germany would be the best thing that seems possible for Europe—the one way to an early and not ruinous peace. Yet the instinctive force of such a discipline

as theirs is almost unbreakable ; and to reach peace, the chiefs must know it necessary to relinquish the conquests, bloodless and bloody alike, of these last twelve months. That surrender seems to be beyond reasonable hope ; and indeed nowhere stronger than in Germany is the feeling " My country, right or wrong ". English papers in the last few weeks reported one singular instance ; a Jewish refugee demanded his passage back to Germany, that he might play his part in serving his country. For he said, he was a German first.

* * * * *

But it is precisely this spirit which the Russian contagion saps. All the elements of class war lie strewn about ; good men and bad men, honest fanatics, honest folk

**If the Ulcer
Bursts** who are simply sickened (as well they may be) by much that honest folk have endured—all may be readily turned into a seething mass of disaffection. If that ulcer bursts, the poison of it will not be confined to Germany ; yet that it may burst, is the likeliest hope of an early end to the conflict which as yet, in this third week of October, has hardly begun. Here is the real strategic justification for what seems to many a wanton dispersal of effort, in this campaign of leaflet dropping. It seems to us, in the outside world, that if the Germans knew the truth of things, they would rid themselves and us of Hitler ; and since admittedly he and his spare no effort to prevent admission of the truth, as the outside world sees it, there is strong argument for striking measures to get it in.

Meantime we have to face the fact that in the regions which border on the Baltic England and France can do little. It is, however, probable that Russia will desire to continue the supply, especially of timber, to Great Britain ; and if so, some collision between her interests and the German submarine campaign must occur. Sweden and Norway, naturally incensed by Germany's high-handed action, seem likely to accept the offered chance of convoy and Sweden at least shows a disposition to defend the freedom of her own coastal waters. Finland, threatened by Russia with the same alleged advantages which the lesser sea-bordering states have been constrained to accept, puts up a stiff back ! Finland was never easy under Russian

domination, and some League between her and the Scandinavian states is indicated as desirable—though hazardous. Italy, meanwhile, stands aloof; the moment has not come when she may put up to auction a decisive aid. Probably the monarchy exercises more influence in Italy than is generally believed; the *Duce* is a less uncontrolled autocrat than the *Führer*. At all events on a computation, it looks as if Russia's interposition between Germany and Rumania had increased the chances for Italy of a leading part in the Balkans and the Danubian region; it is therefore not likely that it will suit Mussolini's game to strengthen Russia. Or, for that matter, Germany.

* * * * *

People begin to talk of Russia's moving towards India. They do not realize how vast a field lies open to Russia in the Farther East, nor how necessary it is for her to anticipate Japan in occupying what lies west of China, and is not, like all inside China, over-peopled. Between the Far East and the Baltic, she has enough to engage her—and more than enough chance of making trouble. In the Near East signs are gratifying and Jewry has taken up an attitude which shows its trained intelligence and sense of realities. The recent decisions of the British Government about Palestine were a bitter disappointment to them and must even have seemed a betrayal: a temperamental people (such as the Irish) would have seized the first occasion to throw obstacles in England's way—even if it were to their own detriment. The Jews, however, realized that in this contest what mattered to them was that Germany should be beaten; nor was it only that. A long minded race, they remember benefits as well as injuries; they have cause to be grateful to England and they do not forget it. Once they took this stand, it was clear that the Arabs would be obliged to rival their loyalty—unless they believed that England was going to be beaten. It is an interesting fact that the whole Moslem world seems to expect England to prevail—as many of its leaders would earnestly desire. But not all; yet all act as if England were the horse to back.

Then there is India, where both Moslem and Hindu show at least their sense that a Nazi victory would be disastrous; and there is evidence that Lord Linlithgow has been successful in

**Eastern
Problems**

conveying to India at large the impression that the English power desires to see India become more and more completely self-governing. The difficulties, as everyone knows, arise from the clash between various Indian ideals rather than because any one of those ideals cannot be reconciled with British interests or principles. But one thing is clear. This war comes at an unlucky moment, when a vast constitutional experiment was being peacefully worked out. Now that it has come, movement must be quickened. Great Britain has the luck to have in Mr. Gandhi a man of good will, whose influence with the Hindu majority will certainly not be used in any spirit of hostility to the English power. If I had the chance, I would implore the Government of India to consider urgently, not what is the least that Mr. Gandhi may possibly accept, but what is the utmost that they can offer to him, consistently with their obligations; and then to propose it without delay.



CHRISTOPHER TURNOR'S *new book*

YEOMAN CALLING

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS.

7s. 6d. net (postage 6d.)

CHRISTOPHER TURNOR is a landowner who has farmed large areas of land, and has studied agriculture in many countries. He is well known as a champion of enlightened progress in land policy, and of the landowner's right to fair treatment and a fair rent.

YEOMAN CALLING contains new proposals, especially for the better organisation of production and marketing, for a system of rural credit suited to the needs of farmers, and for a great annual increase of food production.

W. & R. CHAMBERS, LTD., LONDON & EDINBURGH

THE FORTNIGHTLY LIBRARY

EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION

HADUR

THE RISE OF EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION, by Charles Seignobos. *Cape.*

THE RACES OF CENTRAL EUROPE, by G. M. Morant. *Allen & Unwin.*

It is possible at all to give in a single volume a coherent account of the development of European civilization from the earliest times up to to-day, and few historians are better qualified for the task than the veteran French professor, Charles Seignobos. He has great learning, great accuracy, and the widest of interests. These qualities are well in evidence in his latest book, which summarises a life's work. It is a genuine "history of civilization" which gives the political framework only in the briefest outline, concentrating its effort on the attempt to show how men—and women, who are not forgotten—lived at different ages and lands. Religion, social and economic systems, arts and letters, the discoveries of sciences down to such details as the discovery of an improved method of harnessing horses—have their place in a story told in a vivid and lively style which the translation by C. Alison Philips has not impaired. No reader can set this book down without feeling himself the richer for an enormous store of interesting material.

It is, however, doubtful whether this history, able as it is, will ever rank as a classic. Waters so wide must run shallow and the author's conscious enumeration of as many facts as possible reduces some of his paragraphs to little more than lists of names (this being so, it is rather curious that he does not give more dates). One misses imagination, the synthetic touch—in a word, genius. A broader, more impressionist style would have given much more satisfactory results to most readers. This remains something of a text book, with the disadvantage that with its immense field, it is too scanty on almost any individual subject to be a satisfactory text book on it. Nor does Professor Seignobos altogether succeed in what seems to have been his main object to show the development of a distinctive European civilization, of a single Europe. In spite of the regular treatment by epochs rather than by countries, in spite of a reasonable degree of impartiality (although France does perhaps receive rather more than her due share of space), somehow the figure of Europe refuses to come alive. But to say that this is not a masterpiece does not imply that it is not an extremely able, and a very successful, piece of work.

Mr. Morant's little book on the races of Central Europe is very interest-

ing, if somewhat inconclusive. He does succeed in showing that, by the various anthropological standards the "racial" theories current in parts of Central Europe, and particularly in Germany, are entirely absurd. Judged by any of these standards, the Germans are about the most mixed "race" of any people in Europe. Not that the Germans are the only people to come off ill; both cephalic indices and criteria of stature show the Slovaks to be more closely related to the Magyars than to the Czechs. Interestingly enough, the one people which (according to the data collected by M. Morant) really stands apart is that of the Szeklers in Transylvania, whose cephalic index differs markedly from that of the surrounding Roumanians, while in their percentage of blood-group O they are unique.

It is difficult for a layman to judge a highly specialized book like this. It is perhaps legitimate to suggest that the data used seem to be rather limited, and that insufficient regard is paid to known varieties of origin within a given country. Thus the maps showing both cephalic index and stature mark as "Austrian" (and show as differing notably from other "German" peoples) an area in which the population is notoriously of Slovene origin; or at any rate Slovene-speaking to-day, and not of Germanic origin. And it is hard for a traveller who has often seen, but never measured, the heads of the inhabitants of Western and Eastern Hungary respectively to be satisfied with maps which treat these as one people. But Mr. Morant certainly has the better of his argument with Herr Hitler (except, indeed, on the not unimportant point that the average

German does differ physically from the average Jew or gypsy). Whether the belief in racial theory can be in the slightest degree affected by any demonstration of its falsity is, unfortunately, another question.

THE FATE OF HOMO SAPIENS, by H. G. Wells. *Secker & Warburg* 10s. 6d.

THE DISCOVERY OF MAN, by Stanley Casson. *Hamish Hamilton*. 12s. 6d.

In this volume Mr. Wells looks round the whole world to see what hope there is for us. It is a very good book; it accomplishes just what we want—a review and an examination of all the significant forces to discover if there is anywhere a real progressive plan. A despairing search. Mr. Wells never loses sight of the one movement which could save us—a pool of the world's intelligence and information, a World Brain as he calls it. "There exist", he urges repeatedly, "already scattered about the world all the knowledge and imaginative material required to turn not merely these seething four hundred million people but the whole world into one incessantly progressive and happily interested world community. All that is needed is to assemble that scattered knowledge and these constructive ideas into an effective form. The world cannot go on, a hydra-headed confusion of sovereignties; it has to concentrate its direction in a World Brain. The organization of a few thousand workers and the expenditure of a few score million pounds could bring that indispensable organization into being. And I doubt if it will ever be done." He looks round and admirably sums up the situation in China, Japan, America

India, England, and the
 itarian countries, and in none of
 can he discern any responsible
 progressive movement—though
 es to give Russia its due. He says
 he chooses throughout; and if he
 of Hitler, "It is plain that the
 er is insane" he is just as out-
 en about the Jews and the English
 archy and the Catholic Church—
 tters in which a plain man speaks
 mind. This is a book to study and
 rush through. What he has to say
 at the frustration of the young men
 world over, goes very deep.

The Discovery of Man is an attempt
 sketch "the outlines of a single
 —the story of how man has come
 e studied objectively". It is an
 emic work, a volume of information.
 as no new line. The author has
 ing of importance to say. When
 king of the Greeks he says in
 ection with the problem of evolu-
 "already we encounter that great
 in human enquiry which has often
 a left unsolved and on whose
 tion depends the future of scientific
 dy. It is a vital test for mankind.
 t is triumphantly overcome, human
 gress is possible. If man fails in the
 eal, all human speculation, all human
 ention, all human advancement,
 decline and man may degenerate
 a mere unspeculative human
 nal." This statement is too
 bled in its thought to give dynamic
 he work. But the information is at
 es most interesting, and Mr. Casson
 es us some fascinating extracts from
 Greeks. Take this from Anaxa-
 der—"Men were first produced
 in fishes and nourished like mud-
 . . . Animals came into existence
 a process of evaporation by the sun ;

but man came into existence in the
 likeness of another animal, in the first
 instance of a fish." This was the
 Sixth Century B.C. That gives us
 pause for thought.

JOHN STEWART COLLIS

THE MARCH OF LITERATURE, by
 Ford Madox Ford. *Allen & Unwin.*
 16s.

**THE JACKDAW'S NEST, A FIVEFOLD
 ANTHOLOGY**, by Gerald Bullett.
Macmillan. 10s. 6d.

Reading will go on; it may increase.
 The darkness that has descended on us
 will make a warm room, well-shuttered,
 the safest place on a winter evening.
 From the varied life of six months ago
 we are led back to the eighteenth-
 century amusements which Cowper
 admired, and among them prominently
 the book. These two volumes though
 not designed for these abnormal con-
 ditions, admirably fit the purpose.
 They are both generous in length,
 varied and human in content. Mr.
 Gerald Bullett is one of the most fully
 proved anthologists. He has novelty,
 alertness and a deeply impressive
 sincerity. The sincerity abides in all
 his varied choice in the "Jackdaw's
 Nest". Above all, he has a skill in
 avoiding the usual pieces. All moods
 find a place, the comic, tragic, and
 ridiculous; stories, poems, philosophy
 and anecdote. Dorothy Wordsworth
 is here and P. G. Wodehouse, Henry
 Vaughan and Sterne, Donne and Conan
 Doyle. As Mr. Bullett writes, in his
 preface, "you will meet, I believe,
 nothing merely painful, nothing
 calculated to assault the emotions and
 lacerate the nerves to no purpose.
 Whatever its shortcomings it is at
 least a peaceable anthology, and as

such may be not unwelcome to a harassed generation."

The selection extends to over a thousand pages, and to my mind it is one of the most successful volumes of its kind that has appeared for years. From such abundance it is difficult to quote, but as I turn these pages I come back constantly to a clever little whimsy by that veteran of all anthologists, Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch :

Two students of Psycho-Analysis
Corresponded on Sexual Fallacies

Till confusion arose

And now nobody knows

Which Algernon was or which Alice is.

This trifle gives no impression of the more ambitious extracts where the mind comes back through pathos, beauty and colour to the memory of those emotions which have given human life its quality.

Mr. Ford Madox Ford's volume, which covers literature from the earliest days to modern times, is less easy to define. Most of these "outline" volumes follow a well-known design, and eschew independent judgments. Mr. Ford is far more like Don Quixote than Baedeker. In the retreat of Olivet College, Michigan, Mr. Ford allowed his mind to range over literature from Confucius to Oscar Wilde, and from Xenophon to Conrad with surprising results. Like all the work he produced it has some strain of genius mingled with pose, sound judgments mixed with caperings and an ever certain absence of order and proportion. On ancient and medieval literature Mr. Ford is an entertaining but not always an adequate guide. In the later periods his vehemence and high spirits are excellently stimulating. Characteristic is his defence of Smollett against Fielding :

That this writer should immensely prefer the coarser Roderick Random to the perfumed, coloured and heartless paragraphs of Fielding's *magnum opus*, the reader will probably by this time be in a position to anticipate.

The whole view is fantastic and preposterous, but the argument is stated with such energy that the reader must consider the whole issue afresh. The specialist who reads this book will be exasperated and the general reader surprised ; but as with Mr. Bullett's *Anthology* the mind will go back to those humane things which from time to time, only too rarely, have occupied humanity.

B. IFOR EVANS

THE PADEREWSKI MEMOIRS, by

Ignace Jan Paderewski and Mary Lawton. *Collins*. 21s.

MOZART, by Annette Kolb. *Gollancz*. 16s.

The publication of the first volume of Paderewski's memoirs, written in collaboration with the American author Mary Lawton, comes at an appropriate moment, when our thoughts are so much with Poland, for as well as being a great musician he is one of the unhappy country's staunchest patriots. This first volume, which contains in the foreword a letter from Bernard Shaw, is mainly concerned with Paderewski's musical career up to the outbreak of the Great War. The history of his political career, as the first Prime Minister of Poland in 1919, will be told in a subsequent volume.

Paderewski was born in 1860 in a remote Polish village in a part of the country then under Russian rule. The child developed at a very early age an intense love of his country and a desire to see it freed from opposition—a desire

h was fostered by the hardships and injustices to which they were constantly subjected. This ardent patriotism developed as he grew older. Throughout his musical career, when he travelled all over the world, he never forgot his country's troubles but was always watchful for the occasion when he could serve it. Here is a remarkable instance of his feeling: "When I was twelve years old, I read the description of the battle of Grönwald, which was fought in 1410 against the Knights of the Cross (the Germans) and which resulted in a tremendous victory for the Poles. I conceived then the idea that in the year 1910 would be the 500th anniversary of that victory how wonderful it would be if I, at that time, could erect a monument for that great anniversary." This youthful ambition was actually fulfilled; in 1910, when he was fifty, he presented the city of Poznań with a monument to the battle.

Paderewski's musical talent showed itself at a very early age and, thanks to the foresight of his father, he was eventually sent to the Warsaw Conservatory. He suffered the hardships and disappointments usual to the artist fighting for recognition; he was often subjected to insults on account of his nationality and he was living in an age when musical giants were numerous. At that time, however, his genius was acknowledged and acclaimed and his magnetic personality—and wonderful voice!—gained a hold on public imagination. The story of his later years is revealing in the devastating picture it gives of the life of a world-famous celebrity—the constant travelling, bad food and conditions of work, and all the attendant, and often importunate,

publicity. The tale is simply, indeed naïvely, told. One rather wearied of reading of the adulation of kings, princes and noblemen, so frequently recounted, but on the other hand one is grateful for the delightful portraits of musical, literary, artistic and political personalities, and the book is packed with anecdotes. It is to be hoped that the second volume will not be too long delayed, so that we may continue the story of this great and lovable man.

Paderewski's life has little in common with that of Mozart. Both men were supremely sure of themselves as musicians; a self-assurance which gave them a certain arrogance, particularly in the case of Mozart. But whereas Paderewski's life, after he had conquered the early setbacks, went from triumph to triumph, Mozart's, alas, was in many respects the opposite. As a child he was fêted and idolized as the most remarkable musical prodigy ever known, but it is one of the greatest tragedies in the history of music that this recognition did not follow him in later years, for throughout most of his short adult life he had to suffer neglect and slights to a heartbreaking degree.

Miss Annette Kolb's biography is not concerned with Mozart's music, except for passing discussions of his operas, but by drawing on his letters, and many from his father, she gives us a vivid picture of his life and character. If there be any who still think of Mozart as a 'sweet' and rather artless person they should read this book for they will then realize that underneath a charming and courteous manner was hidden a virile, and often ruthless, nature.

ELIZABETH VOSS.

DEMOCRACY IN THE DOCK, by
Gideon Clark.

THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCENE,
by Frank Darvall.

Nelson Discussion Books, 2s. 6d. each.

Mr. Clark cross-examines his prisoner in much the same terms as Jeremy Bentham would have employed had he been writing *A Fragment on Government* as articles for the *Daily Express*. "One test alone is of real importance. It is : Does democracy make for the greatest happiness, material and spiritual, of the greatest number ?" And the goals of such a democracy ? Why, one of them of course is, to "recreate a British peasantry tilling their own fields, growing their own food". This being so, it is hardly surprising that Mr. Clark turns a kind eye on the achievements of totalitarian *régimes*, accepting their own estimates of their own success, and never seriously questioning how far total abolition of unemployment implies forced labour, how far "Winter Help Schemes" are extortion in the guise of charity, how far, in fact, democracy and the insect state differ from one another. But despite the prosecutor's avowals, the Benthamite wig does not fit him perfectly. He is worried at "working class snobbery and subservience". But if the working man is happy in his snobbery and subservience, are they not ministers of real democracy ? Consistency collapses under the vigour of Mr. Clark's attack. The defendant stands condemned, and grievously, on the count of class prejudice, of allowing himself to be governed by the Right People. And he must be reformed, by abolition of the House of Lords and hereditary titles, by universal, com-

pulsorily uniform education (How democratic in fact is that ?) and the disestablishment of the Church of England. To inconsistency Mr. Clark adds a few eccentricities ; he believes the English press has improved, that the worst that can be said about our films is that they falsify the past (if so, what *do* they do to the present ?). From all of which you may guess that Mr. Clark's book admirably fulfils its duty of provoking discussion and of asking just the awkward illogical questions that somehow have to be faced up to.

Mr. Darvall, on the other hand, realizes, as no doubt his work at the English-Speaking Union has taught him, that with regard to American democracy the British public needs, not more discussion, but more information. That at least is what he has provided with great accuracy and even more remarkable compression, in 230 pages that give, first an analysis of the American political system, and then an account of the workings of the system since 1921. He concludes with an estimate of the success and prospects of the New Deal. His book contains nothing about American foreign policy, no doubt for the excellent reason that the British public is relatively over-informed about that aspect of American politics. But in compensation he sets out the background and antecedents of the New Deal with a fullness and fairness which is rarely found in British accounts. Without withholding his admiration of Roosevelt, he has done the much needed service of redeeming Hoover from the obloquy, often undeserved, which he still enjoys in a country which is determined to applaud his successor with the enthusiasm the

h public reserves for liberalism on shores. It would be interesting Darvall had given us his opinion at 'dishonesty' which is charged Roosevelt's detractors—discernible any eyes in the Supreme Court Bill now in the new Neutrality measure. This is the grease, which Mr. Clark prescribes, necessary to make democracy work. Anyway here is a President who has made democracy work, despite the plastic obstacles which 48 states and the untempered Constitution scatter in the way. It is the success of Mr. Darvall's that he makes us understand

H. G. NICHOLAS

HOW GREEN WAS MY VALLEY, by Richard Llewellyn. *Michael Joseph*. 6d.

FOUR-PART SETTING, by Ann Bridge. *Matto & Windus*. 8s. 6d.

THE SEA TOWER, by Hugh Walpole. *Macmillan*. 7s. 6d.

ANCE BY APPOINTMENT, by G. E. Trevelyan. *Harrap*. 7s. 6d.

Richard Llewellyn's book has that unique quality of timelessness, a quality shared by the Bible, Marx's Capital, Lenin's Republic, most of Epstein, Shakespeare and Ibsen. And this quality is becoming extremely rare in our literature. D. H. Lawrence looms still as the one influence likely to survive or correct from an ever-growing pile of literary cadavers. Each phase since the Great War till to-day has been taken up, written round, from a man's eye view, from a worm's eye view, from under beds, through keyholes, from behind curtains, and all the while the Man and Woman have become things we see through the neuroses

of the moment. So it is that since the last war Man and Woman have changed their neuroses according to the colour of the political, economic or religious background of the phase. As these phases have lasted anything from six months to two years Bloomsbury has bloomed every possible shade between dull grey to pale pink. And each little phase has had its Trollope, greatest of whom was Aldous. And that is why Gumbriel is dead. He had passed away peacefully with most of Huxley's character's by 1930. R.I.P.

Richard Llewellyn's book is autobiographical and is about a Welsh pit village. His father, mother, brothers and sisters are the immediate influences in his early life. Gradually as he grows up his green valley reveals the mysteries of human relationships, the struggle of man under the earth fighting the coalface and man on the earth fighting his boss. It is more than the story of a Welsh mining community, it is the microcosm of that world that lives by its labour and fights for its freedom. Richard Llewellyn's book is vitally alive in spite of the fact that most of the characters are dead to-day. The last page in the history of the workers' fight for a new world has yet to be written. And that is why there is the breath of life in *How Green Was My Valley*.

In *Four-Part Setting* and *The Sea Tower* we are treated, yet again, to the sight of frustrated middle-class characters tripping over one another's problems. *Four-Part Setting* gives us Rose Pelham, an innocent victim of her middle-class values, who works out her problem in front of a Chinese background. The Chinese setting helps her to see how very green is Golders. She has been

unhappily married, her child dies and she is left, immature and inexperienced, to find the key to *her* happiness and *her* ideals of Love. She puts all the theories she knows—Freud, Jung and Aldous Huxley—to test and finds they ring hollow. Although of a blighted generation, Rose Pelham is skilfully untangled by her creator, Ann Bridge.

Again, in *The Sea Tower*, Love has to fight through a text-book of Freud to get a break. This time *Œdipus* is in the prompt-corner. A domineering mother tries to break up her son's marriage, wielding in the process every weapon in her power. She almost succeeds by wholly subconscious means to attain her ends, but she fails. Translating her wishes into a more material expression of jealousy, she attempts to brand her daughter-in-law with a red-hot fire-iron. Again she fails, with the inevitable consequence. She loses her son, who, with his wife, unites in everlasting Love. It is quite a time since *Œdipus* peeped through the pages of a modern novel. And, in a sense, it is refreshing to make this old gentleman's acquaintance again. Were it not for Hugh Walpole's craftsmanship, however, he would have palled. As it is the story is told convincingly, without the least danger of inspiring matricide in the breast of any pimply youngest son of a really loving mama.

Miss G. E. Trevelyan very successfully debunks astrology, horoscopy and hocus-pocus generally in her latest novel, *Trance By Appointment*. Jean, as a young girl, is credited with second sight. She is encouraged to go queer and see things. She comes to believe quite genuinely in this faculty ascribed to her. She is trained by a professional clairvoyante and exploited by a

Professor who marries her. Gradually her eyes open sufficiently for her to see the whole business as a cheap fraud. Her trances, which she can usually throw at will, become more and more difficult to perform. She realizes that her 'child spirit' Daisy is no longer real after the birth of her first child, whom she was sure during pregnancy was Daisy materializing. So she decides to practise crystal-gazing for just as long as people want it. You will say that this is a rather gentle and convenient way of letting oneself out of a racket. Perhaps her solution, on the other hand, is an honest one. For she at least knows that all the crystals in the world will not cure a world sick with fear. A woman like Jean might discover old man Marx smiling at her in her tea-cup.

MAX WOOD

MISCELLANEA

OXFORD PAMPHLETS ON WORLD AFFAIRS. 3d. each.

The series of short accounts of current international topics now being published at intervals by the Oxford University Press are of outstanding value. Limited to 32 pages with maps, when advisable on the inside covers, they are sold for threepence each under the title of Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs. Many people, no doubt, are making a point of collecting the whole series which means that up to the time of writing they have spent four shilling and provided themselves with sound background knowledge on sixteen different subjects. The topics cover a wide range, Sir Alfred Zimmern beginning the series with *The Prospects of Civilization* and Professor E. H. Carr

Just Published
OF IMMENSE NATIONAL INTEREST

EVOLUTION OF SEA POWER

*A complete study of modern Naval
warfare, edited by*

C. W. DOMVILLE-FIFE

Contributors include

| | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Admiral Sir Barry Domville | Admiral Mark Kerr |
| Admiral Wilmot Nicholson | Vice-Admiral C. V. Usborne |
| Vice-Admiral J. E. T. Harper | Vice-Admiral Gordon Campbell |
| Commander A. L. Gwynne | E. H. Baxter |
| and Lieut.-Commander Douglas Dixon | |

Illustrated with Charts, Diagrams and Photographs
18s. net

AND PILATE SAID...

A New Study of the Roman Procurator

by **FRANK MORISON**

Author of

"WHO MOVED THE STONE?"

Illustrated with Maps and 56 Photographs
10s. 6d. net

Write for complete Autumn List to :—

DESK F.

RICH & COWAN, 37 BEDFORD SQ., W.C.1

being the author of the most recent issue on *Propaganda in International Politics*. All the contributors maintain a high standard of interest but since Eastern Europe is our main source of worry at the moment, *Turkey, Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean*, by G. F. Hudson, *The Danubian Basin*, by C. A. Macartney, *The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and Germany's Eastern Policy*, by J. W. Wheeler-Bennett and *Czechoslovakia*, by R. Birley, have a strong appeal as have 'Race' in *Europe*, by Julian Huxley and 'Living Space' and *Population Problems*, by R. R. Kuczynski.

I HAVEN'T UNPACKED, by William Holt. Harrap. 8s. 6d.

Too few autobiographies to-day have anything more to recommend them than

the rather doubtful pleasure which they give of sharing the author's thoughts and opinions as he travels, more or less like the rest of us, through life. Mr. William Holt's story, however, is in quite a different category, for, from the time he started work in a Yorkshire shirt factory at the age of twelve, he has had adventures by the dozen. He taught himself French and German, while working as a weaver, and later learnt Spanish and Russian. He joined up in the last war when sixteen, was a sergeant two years later and at the Armistice was being trained as an officer. He travelled to Spain and Canada for work and round the world as a sailor. He became a communist and was put in prison, and at the same time held several jobs which demonstrated his originality and ability. But easily the best part of the book is the style in which it is written. It is an account of life. It is written well with a refreshing openness, without excuses, and without malice. He is free from that almost universal crime, self-pity and self-justification.

NEW BOOKS

Enormous
Selection
of
New and
Second-hand
Volumes

AT 40% OFF

PUBLISHERS PRICES

SOME BOOK BARGAINS

- "Edward of Kent," a biographical study, illust., by D. Duff. (Pub. 18/-) for 7/-
 "England the Arbiter" or Politics of a Civilisation, by H. Moxon. (Pub. 10/6) for 4/6
 "The Making of England," a Cavalcade of Empire, by D. Evans, illust. (Pub. 5/-) for 2/6
 "Prince Amad of Egypt," an amazing biography, by J. Bland illust. (Pub. 12/6) for 5/6

SEND FOR LATEST LISTS

FICTION
ECONOMICS
HISTORY
LITERATURE
SCIENCE
BIOGRAPHY
POLITICS
TRAVEL

GASTON'S

76 STRAND, LONDON, W.C.2

Tel. TEM. 3048

THE CONFIDENTIAL AGENT, by Graham Greene. Heinemann. 7s. 6d.

Mr. Graham Greene has written another 'thriller' without remembering the recipe which made *Brighton Rock* a really brilliant book. The tale concerns a confidential agent, who experiences a rough time in England from the 'enemy' while trying to buy coal for his Government, now engaged in civil war. Looked at from the worst side the agent has a series of improbable adventures, and ends the book, happily but equally improbably, by escaping from the clutches of the police as he falls, presumably for ever, into the arms

lady-love, the daughter of the
ing. The plot of any 'thriller'
we made to look ridiculous and
quate but one expects from Mr.
ee a richness of characterization,
, in this book, is entirely missing.

TOO LATE NOW, by A. A. Milne.
Thuen. 12s. 6d.

Milne may not be, as he claims,
adimately fond of or interested in
ren", but he has done well, as
to devote the larger portion of
book to telling us how the boy
me a writer. There was little
gh to suggest that he would, when,
me age of eleven, he followed his
er Ken, as a scholar to Westmin-

"When I was twelve, everybody
ght I was going to be a Senior
angler. But at twelve I stopped
ing. I no longer thought mathe-
s grand." This was a sad dis-
antment to Alan Milne's father,
having built his castles in the air,
d himself wondering if his son was
enough to succeed him as Head-
ter at Streete Court. The fear that
Milne would never earn a living
riting was swiftly allayed, when he
ed the *Punch* staff at the age of 24.
n that time it was plain that
hood, school, and undergraduate
s had not been wasted, and the
unt that Mr. Milne now gives of
life has the same charm which is
ciated with his books and plays.

ATH'S OTHER KINGDOM, by
amel Woolsey. Longmans' 6s.

alaga again makes the setting for a
x on the Spanish Civil War, and like
Peter Chalmers Mitchell, Gamel
olsey lived just outside. A personal
ative, it possesses all the vividness
ruth, simply and beautifully told.

THE LIVING THOUGHTS LIBRARY

"AT SUCH A TIME AS THIS we need to marshal all our spiritual resources to preserve our faith in the creative power of reason and brotherhood. THESE THINKERS may have interpreted life very differently, but each and all of them were intent upon affirming man's dignity at a truly human level."

From The Times Literary Supplement.

This series provides in compact form the essential works of the world's philosophers; together with an interpretation by the greatest of present day writers. Each volume costs 2/6d. net.

THE TITLES

NIETZSCHE presented by
HEINRICH MANN

THOREAU presented by
THEODORE DREISER

SCHOPENHAUER by
THOMAS MANN

MONTAIGNE presented by
ANDRE GIDE

TOLSTOI presented by
STEFAN ZWEIG

DARWIN presented by
JULIAN HUXLEY

SPINOZA presented by
ARNOLD ZWEIG

MAZZINI presented by
IGNAZIO SILONE

Further titles in preparation

Please write for prospectus of the series to
CASSELL & CO. Ltd., La Belle Sauvage, E.C.4

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

H. G. Wells : It is rather more than forty years ago that Mr. H. G. Wells contributed his first article to the pages of THE FORTNIGHTLY. Even in those days he was a well known writer although not so well known, apparently, for the Editor to think it superfluous to add "Author of *The Time Machine*, *The Wonderful Visit*, etc., etc.", after his signature. On that occasion Mr. Wells was writing on *Human Evolution*, *An Artificial Process*. The return of Mr. Wells to our pages is very welcome.

W. J. Oudendyk, K.C.M.G. : Sir William Oudendyk is the famous Dutch diplomat to whom not a few Englishmen owe their lives. At the time of the Russian Revolution he was the Netherlands ambassador in Moscow, and it was through his intervention that many lives were saved. Sir William, whose eventful life is recorded in his recent book, *Ways and By-Ways in Diplomacy*, spent a considerable part of his diplomatic life in China.

C. W. Guillebaud : A Cambridge economist, whose original views are held in high respect, Mr. Guillebaud wrote an important book, dealing with the same subject as his article, *The Economic Recovery of Germany*.

Lord Addison : A man of wide interests, Lord Addison was trained as a doctor and later became a Professor of Anatomy. He entered Parliament as a Liberal in 1910 and soon won distinction in a new sphere. He held office on many occasions in the Liberal, Coalition, and Labour Governments, his last appointment being, Minister

of Agriculture and Fisheries, 1930-31.

Geoffrey Household : A novelist, who will not long be denied a place in the first rank, Mr. Household won immediate recognition with his first book, *The Third Hour*. His second novel, *Rogue Male*, was exciting and important.

Lord Ponsonby : The long and distinguished political career began for Lord Ponsonby some years before he finally entered Parliament in 1908 as a Liberal. Becoming a member of the Labour Party, he represented the Brightside Division of Sheffield from 1922-30, during which time he held office several times. Lord Ponsonby was Leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords 1931-35.

Eleanor Rathbone, M.P. : An independent, Miss Rathbone has represented the Combined Universities since 1929 with a loyalty and courage which does credit to herself and to her many causes. A strong speaker, the welfare of all people is her concern.

Henry Baerlein : Only those who have travelled so frequently and so happily as Mr. Baerlein can claim to know their Europe as well as he. One must expect to find Mr. Baerlein in the most unlikely places and afterwards to read one of his attractive and discursive volumes. He travels everywhere and knows everybody.

Notes on our contributors, Admiral Sir Herbert Richmond, General Sir Charles Gwynn, Air-Commodore L. E. O. Charlton and Mr. Stephen Gwynn, appeared in our October number.